arXiv:1703.09314v1 [math.LO] 27 Mar 2017

Reflection calculus and conservativity spectra

Lev D. Beklemishev*
Steklov Mathematical Institute, RAS
email: bekl@mi.ras.ru

March 29, 2017

Abstract

Strictly positive logics recently attracted attention both in the description logic and in the provability logic communities for their combination of efficiency and sufficient expressivity. The language of Reflection Calculus RC consists of implications between formulas built up from propositional variables and constant 'true' using only conjunction and diamond modalities which are interpreted in Peano arithmetic as restricted uniform reflection principles.

We extend the language of RC by another series of modalities representing the operators associating with a given arithmetical theory T its fragment axiomatized by all theorems of T of arithmetical complexity Π^0_n, for all $n > 0$. We note that such operators, in a precise sense, cannot be represented in the full language of modal logic.

We formulate a formal system extending RC that is sound and, as we conjecture, complete under this interpretation. We show that in this system one is able to express iterations of reflection principles up to any ordinal $< \varepsilon_0$. On the other hand, we provide normal forms for its variable-free fragment. Thereby, the variable-free fragment is shown to be algorithmically decidable and complete w.r.t. its natural arithmetical semantics.

1 Introduction

A system, called *Reflection Calculus* and denoted RC, was introduced in [8] and, in a slightly different format, in [14]. From the point of view of modal logic, RC can be seen as a fragment of Japaridze's polymodal provability logic GLP [20, 13] consisting of the implications of the form $A \to B$, where A and B are formulas built-up from $\top$ and propositional variables using just $\wedge$ and the diamond modalities. We call such formulas A and B *strictly positive*.

Strictly positive modal logics independently and earlier appeared in the work on description logic, see [23] for some results and further references. In particular, the strictly positive language corresponds to the OWL2EL profile of the OWL web ontology language.

Reflection calculus RC is much simpler than its modal companion GLP yet expressive enough to regain its main proof-theoretic applications. It has been outlined in [8] that RC allows to define a natural system of ordinal notations up to ε_0 and serves as a convenient basis for a proof-theoretic analysis of Peano Arithmetic in the style of [5, 6]. This includes a consistency proof for Peano arithmetic based on transfinite induction up to ε_0, a characterization of its Π^0_n-consequences in terms of iterated reflection principles, a slowly terminating term rewriting system [2] and a combinatorial independence result [7].

*Research financed by a grant of the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 16-11-10252).

An axiomatization of RC (as an equational calculus) has been found by Evgeny Dashkov in his paper [14] which initiated the study of strictly positive fragments of provability logics. Dashkov proved two important further facts about RC which sharply contrast with the corresponding properties of GLP. Firstly, RC is complete with respect to a natural class of finite Kripke frames. Secondly, RC is decidable in polynomial time, whereas most of the standard modal logics are PSPACE-complete and the same holds for the variable-free fragment of GLP [25].

Another advantage of going to a strictly positive language is exploited in the present paper. Strictly positive modal formulas allow for more general arithmetical interpretations than those of the standard modal logic language. In particular, propositional formulas can now be interpreted as arithmetical *theories* rather than individual *sentences*. (Notice that the 'negation' of a theory would not be well-defined.)

Any monotone operator acting on the semilattice of arithmetical theories can be considered as a modality in strictly positive logic. One such operation is particularly attractive from the point of view of proof-theoretic applications, namely the map associating with a theory T its fragment $\mathit{\Pi}_{n+1}(T)$ axiomatized by all theorems of T of arithmetical complexity Π^0_{n+1}. Since the Π^0_{n+1}-conservativity relation of T over S can be expressed by $S \vdash \mathit{\Pi}_{n+1}(T)$, we call such operators Π^0_{n+1}-*conservativity operators*.

This relates our study to the fruitful tradition of research on conservativity and interpretability logics, see e.g. [28, 15, 17]. Our framework happens to be both weaker and stronger than the traditional one: in our system we are able to express the conservativity relations for each class Π^0_{n+1} and are able to relate not only sentences but theories. However, in this framework the negation is lacking and the conservativity is not a binary modality and cannot be iterated. Yet, we believe that the strictly positive language is both simpler and better tuned to the needs of proof-theoretic analysis of formal systems of arithmetic.

We introduce the system RC^∇ with modalities $\diamond_n$ representing uniform reflection principles of arithmetical complexity Σ_n, and ∇_n representing Π_{n+1}-conservativity operators. We provide an adequate semantics of RC^∇ in terms of the semilattice $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ of (numerated) arithmetical r.e. theories extending elementary arithmetic EA. Further, we introduce transfinite iterations of monotone semi-idempotent operators along elementary well-orderings, somewhat generalizing the notion of a Turing–Feferman recursive progression of axiomatic systems but mainly following the same development as in [7]. Our first result shows that RC^∇ can express α-iterations of modalities $\diamond_n$, for each $n < \omega$ and ordinals $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$. This result requires some arithmetical prerequisites and is postponed until the Appendix. A variable-free strictly positive logic where such iterations are explicitly present in the language has been introduced by Joosten and Reyes [21] which is, thereby, contained in RC^∇.

Then we turn to a purely syntactic study of the variable-free fragment of the system RC^∇ and provide unique normal forms for its formulas. A corollary is that the variable-free fragment of RC^∇ is decidable and arithmetically complete.

Whereas the normal forms for the variable-free formulas of RC correspond in a unique way to ordinals below ε_0, the normal forms of RC^∇ are more general. It turns out that they are related in a canonical way to the collections of proof-theoretic ordinals of (bounded) arithmetical theories for each complexity level Π_{n+1}, as defined in [7].

Studying the collections of proof-theoretic ordinals corresponding to several levels of logical complexity as single objects seems to be a rather recent and interesting paradigm shift. Such collections appeared for the first time in the work of Joost Joosten [22] under the name *Turing–Taylor expansions*. He established a one-to-one correspondence between such collections (for a certain class of theories) and the points of the universal model for the variable-free fragment of GLP due to

Konstantin Ignatiev. We call such collections *conservativity spectra* of arithmetical theories. Our results show that RC^{∇} provides a way to syntactically represent and conveniently handle such conservativity spectra.

The third part of our paper provides an algebraic model $\mathfrak{I}$ for the variable-free fragment of RC^{∇}. This model is obtained in a canonical way on the basis of the Ignatiev model. Our main theorem states the isomorphism of several representations of $\mathfrak{I}$: the Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra of the variable-free fragment of RC^{∇}; a constructive representation in terms of sequences of ordinals below ε_0; a representation in terms of the semilattice of bounded RC-theories and as the algebra of cones of the Ignatiev model. This result underscores the naturality of the introduced structure and its importance for the proof-theoretic applications of provability logic.

2 The lattice of arithmetical theories

We define the intended arithmetical interpretation of the strictly positive modal language. Propositional variables (and strictly positive formulas) will now denote possibly infinite theories rather than individual sentences. We deal with r.e. theories formulated in the language of *elementary arithmetic* EA and containing the axioms of EA. To avoid well-known problems with the representation of theories in arithmetic, we assume that each theory S comes equipped with an *elementary recursive numeration*, that is, a bounded formula $\sigma(x)$ in the language of EA defining the set of axioms of S in the standard model of arithmetic $\mathbb{N}$.

Given such a σ, we have a standard arithmetical Σ_1-formula $\Box_\sigma(x)$ expressing the provability of x in S (see [16]). We often write $\Box_\sigma\varphi$ for $\Box_\sigma(\ulcorner\varphi\urcorner)$. The expression $\bar{n}$ denotes the numeral $0'^{\cdots\prime}$ (n times). If $\varphi(v)$ contains a parameter v, then $\Box_\sigma\varphi(\bar{x})$ denotes a formula (with a parameter x) expressing the provability of the sentence $\varphi(\bar{x}/v)$ in S.

Given two numerations σ and τ, we write $\sigma \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau$ if

$$\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall x\, (\Box_\tau(x) \to \Box_\sigma(x)).$$

We will only consider the numerations σ such that $\sigma \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma_{\mathrm{EA}}$, where σ_{EA} is some standard numeration of EA. We call such numerated theories *Gödelian extensions of* EA.

Relation $\vdash_{\mathrm{EA}}$ defines a natural preorder on the set $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ of Gödelian extensions of EA. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ denote the quotient by the associated equivalence relation $=_{\mathrm{EA}}$, where by definition $\sigma =_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau$ iff both $\sigma \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau$ and $\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$. $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ is a lattice with $\wedge_{\mathrm{EA}}$ corresponding to the union of theories and $\vee_{\mathrm{EA}}$ to their intersection. These operations are defined on elementary numerations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \wedge_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau &:= \sigma(x) \vee \tau(x), \\ \sigma \vee_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau &:= \exists x_1, x_2 \leqslant x\, (\sigma(x_1) \wedge \tau(x_2) \wedge x = \mathrm{disj}(x_1, x_2)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{disj}(x_1, x_2)$ is an elementary term computing the Gödel number of the disjunction of formulas given by Gödel numbers x_1 and x_2.

We will only be concerned with the operation $\wedge_{\mathrm{EA}}$, that is, with the structure of lower semilattice $(\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_{\mathrm{EA}}, \wedge_{\mathrm{EA}})$. Notice that the top element 1_{EA} corresponds to (the equivalence class of) EA, whereas 0_{EA} is the class of all inconsistent extensions of EA.

An operator $R : \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}} \to \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ is called *extensional* if $\sigma =_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau$ implies $R(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\tau)$. Similarly, R is called *monotone* if $\sigma \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \tau$ implies $R(\sigma) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\tau)$. Clearly, each monotone operator is extensional and each extensional operator correctly acts on the quotient lattice $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_{\mathrm{EA}}$. An operator R is called *semi-idempotent* if $R(R(\sigma)) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\sigma)$. R is a *closure* operator if it is monotone, semi-idempotent

and, in addition, $\sigma \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\sigma)$. Operators considered in this paper will usually be at least monotone and semi-idempotent.

Meaningful monotone operators abound in arithmetic. Typical examples are the uniform Σ_n-reflection principles $R_n(\sigma)$ associating with σ the extension of EA by the schema $\{\forall x\ (\Box_\sigma \varphi(\bar{x}) \to \varphi(x)) : \varphi \in \Sigma_n\}$ taken with its natural elementary numeration that we denote $x \in R_n(\sigma)$. It is known that the theory $R_n(\sigma)$ is finitely axiomatizable. Moreover, $R_0(\sigma)$ is equivalent to Gödel's consistency assertion $\mathrm{Con}(\sigma)$ for σ.

In this paper we will study another series of monotone operators. Given a theory S numerated by σ, let $\mathit{\Pi}_n(S)$ denote the extension of EA by all theorems of S of complexity Π_n. The set $\mathit{\Pi}_n(S)$ is r.e. but in general not elementary recursive. In order to comply with our definitions we apply a form of Craig's trick that yields an elementary axiomatization of $\mathit{\Pi}_n(S)$.[1] Let $\mathit{\Pi}_n(\sigma)$ denote the elementary formula

$$\exists y, p \leqslant x\ (\mathrm{Prf}_\sigma(y,p) \wedge y \in \Pi_n \wedge x = \mathrm{disj}(y, \ulcorner \bar{p} \neq \bar{p} \urcorner))$$

and the theory numerated by this formula over EA. Here, $\mathrm{Prf}_\sigma(y,p)$ is an elementary formula expressing that p is the Gödel number of a proof of x, so that $\exists p \mathrm{Prf}_\sigma(y,p)$ is $\Box_\sigma(y)$; and $x \in \Pi_n$ is an elementary formula expressing that x is the Gödel number of a Π_n-sentence. Then it is easy to see that the theory $\mathit{\Pi}_n(\sigma)$ is deductively equivalent to $\mathit{\Pi}_n(S)$. Notice that all the operators R_n and $\mathit{\Pi}_n$ are monotone and semi-idempotent, moreover $\mathit{\Pi}_n$ is a closure.

It is also clear that EA can be replaced in all the previous considerations by any of its Gödelian extensions T. The main source of interest for us in this paper will be the structure of semilattice with operators

$$(\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_T, \wedge_T, \{R_n, \mathit{\Pi}_{n+1} : n < \omega\}).$$

We call it *the* RC^∇*-algebra of Gödelian extensions of* T. The term RC^∇*-algebra* will be explained below.

3 Strictly positive logics and reflection calculi

We refer the reader to a note [1] for a short introduction to strictly positive logic and to [23] for more information from the description logic perspective.

3.1 Normal strictly positive logics

Consider a modal language $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ with propositional variables $p, q, \ldots$, a constant $\top$, conjunction $\wedge$, and a possibly infinite set of symbols $\Sigma = \{a_i : i \in J\}$ understood as diamond modalities. The family Σ is called the *signature* of the language $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$. Strictly positive formulas (or simply *formulas*) are built up by the grammar:

$$A ::= p \mid \top \mid (A \wedge A) \mid aA, \quad \text{where } a \in \Sigma.$$

Sequents are expressions of the form $A \vdash B$ where A, B are strictly positive formulas.

Basic sequent-style system, denoted K^+, is given by the following axioms and rules:

1. $A \vdash A$; $\quad A \vdash \top$; $\quad$ if $A \vdash B$ and $B \vdash C$ then $A \vdash C$;
2. $A \wedge B \vdash A$; $\quad A \wedge B \vdash B$; $\quad$ if $A \vdash B$ and $A \vdash C$ then $A \vdash B \wedge C$;
3. if $A \vdash B$ then $aA \vdash aB$, for each $a \in \Sigma$.

[1] Over $\mathrm{EA} + B\Sigma_1$ one can work with a natural r.e. axiomatization of $\mathit{\Pi}_n(S)$.

It is well-known that K^+ axiomatizes the strictly positive fragment of a polymodal version of basic modal logic K. All our systems will also contain the following principle corresponding to the transitivity axiom in modal logic:

4. $aaA \vdash aA$.

The extension of K^+ by this axiom will be denoted $\mathrm{K4}^+$.

Let $C[A/p]$ denote the result of replacing in C all occurrences of a variable p by A. A set of sequents L is called a *normal strictly positive logic* if it contains the axioms and is closed under the rules of K^+ and under the following *substitution rule*: if $(A \vdash B) \in L$ then $(A[C/p] \vdash B[C/p]) \in L$. We will only consider normal strictly positive logics below. We write $A \vdash_L B$ for the statement that $A \vdash B$ is provable in L (or belongs to L). $A =_L B$ means $A \vdash_L B$ and $B \vdash_L A$.

Any normal strictly positive logic L satisfies the following simple *positive replacement lemma* that we leave without proof.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose $A \vdash_L B$, then $C[A/p] \vdash_L C[B/p]$, for any formula C.*

3.2 The system RC

Reflection calculus RC is a normal strictly positive logic formulated in the signature $\{\Diamond_n : n \in \omega\}$. It is obtained by adjoining to the axioms and rules of $\mathrm{K4}^+$ (stated for each $\Diamond_n$) the following principles:

5. $\Diamond_n A \vdash \Diamond_m A$, for all $n > m$;

6. $\Diamond_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B \vdash \Diamond_n(A \wedge \Diamond_m B)$, for all $n > m$.

We notice that RC proves the following *polytransitivity* principles:

$$\Diamond_n \Diamond_m A \vdash \Diamond_m A, \quad \Diamond_m \Diamond_n A \vdash \Diamond_m A, \quad \text{for each } m \leqslant n.$$

Also, the converse of Axiom 6 is provable in RC, so that in fact we have

$$\Diamond_n(A \wedge \Diamond_m B) =_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B. \tag{1}$$

The system RC was introduced in an equational logic format by Dashkov [14], the present formulation is from [8]. Dashkov showed that RC axiomatizes the set of all sequents $A \vdash B$ such that the implication $A \to B$ is provable in the polymodal logic GLP. Moreover, unlike GLP itself, RC is polytime decidable (whereas GLP is PSPACE-complete [26]) and enjoys the finite model property (whereas GLP is Kripke incomplete).

We recall a correspondence between variable-free RC-formulas and ordinals [5]. Let $\mathbb{F}$ denote the set of all variable-free RC-formulas, and let $\mathbb{F}_n$ denote its restriction to the signature $\{\Diamond_i : i \geqslant n\}$, so that $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_0$. For each $n \in \omega$ we define binary relations $<_n$ on $\mathbb{F}$ by

$$A <_n B \iff^{\mathrm{def}} B \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_n A.$$

Obviously, $<_n$ is a transitive relation invariantly defined on the equivalence classes w.r.t. provable equivalence in RC (denoted $=_{\mathrm{RC}}$). Since RC is polytime decidable, so are both $=_{\mathrm{RC}}$ and all of $<_n$.

An RC-formula without variables and $\wedge$ is called a *word*. In fact, any such formula syntactically is a finite sequence of letters $\Diamond_i$ (followed by $\top$). If A, B are words then AB will denote $A[\top/B]$, that is, the word corresponding to the concatenation of these sequences. $A \stackrel{\circ}{=} B$ denotes the graphical identity of formulas (words).

The set of all words will be denoted $\mathbb{W}$, and $\mathbb{W}_n$ will denote its restriction to the signature $\{\Diamond_i : i \geqslant n\}$. The following facts are from [5, 8]:

- Every $A \in \mathbb{F}_n$ is RC-equivalent to a word in $\mathbb{W}_n$;
- $(\mathbb{W}_n/{=_{\mathrm{RC}}}, <_n)$ is isomorphic to $(\varepsilon_0, <)$.

Here, ε_0 is the first ordinal α such that $\omega^\alpha = \alpha$. Thus, the set $\mathbb{W}_n/{=_{\mathrm{RC}}}$ is well-ordered by the relation $<_n$. The isomorphism can be established by an onto and order preserving function $o_n : \mathbb{W}_n \to \varepsilon_0$ such that, for all $A, B \in \mathbb{W}_n$,

$$A =_{\mathrm{RC}} B \iff o_n(A) = o_n(B).$$

Then $o_n(A)$ is the order type of $\{B \in \mathbb{W}_n : B <_n A\}/{=_{\mathrm{RC}}}$.

The function $o(A) := o_0(A)$ can be inductively calculated as follows: If $A \mathrel{\dot{=}} \Diamond_0^k \top$ then $o(A) = k$. If $A \mathrel{\dot{=}} A_1 0 A_2 0 \cdots 0 A_n$, where all $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_1$ and not all of them are empty, then

$$o(A) = \omega^{o(A_n^-)} + \cdots + \omega^{o(A_1^-)}.$$

Here, B^- is obtained from $B \in \mathbb{W}_1$ replacing every $\Diamond_{m+1}$ by $\Diamond_m$. For $n > 0$ and $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$ we let $o_n(A) = o_{n-1}(A^-)$.

3.3 The system RC^∇

Definition 1 The signature of RC^∇ consists of modalities $\Diamond_n$ and ∇_n, for each $n < \omega$. The system RC^∇ is a normal strictly positive logic given by the following axioms and rules, for all $m, n < \omega$:

1. RC for $\Diamond_n$; RC for ∇_n;
2. $A \vdash \nabla_n A$;
3. $\Diamond_n A \vdash \nabla_n A$;
4. $\Diamond_m \nabla_n A \vdash \Diamond_m A$; $\nabla_n \Diamond_m A \vdash \Diamond_m A$ if $m \leqslant n$.

As a basic syntactic fact about RC^∇ we mention the following useful lemma. We often write $=$ for $=_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla}$.

Lemma 3.2 *The following are theorems of* RC^∇*, for all* $m < n$*:*

(i) $\Diamond_n(A \wedge \nabla_m B) = \Diamond_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B$*;*

(ii) $\nabla_n(A \wedge \Diamond_m B) = \nabla_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B$*.*

Proof. (i) Part ($\vdash$) follows from $\Diamond_n \nabla_m B \vdash \Diamond_m B$. Part ($\dashv$) follows from $\Diamond_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B \vdash \Diamond_n(A \wedge \Diamond_m B) \vdash \Diamond_n(A \wedge \nabla_m B)$ using positive replacement.

(ii) Part ($\vdash$) follows from $\nabla_n \Diamond_m B \vdash \Diamond_m B$. Part ($\dashv$) follows from $\nabla_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B \vdash \nabla_n A \wedge \nabla_m \Diamond_m B \vdash \nabla_n(A \wedge \nabla_m \Diamond_m B) \vdash \nabla_n(A \wedge \Diamond_m B)$ using Axiom 6 for ∇ modalities, the fact that $\Diamond_m B = \nabla_m \Diamond_m B$ and positive replacement. $\Box$

A formula A is called *ordered* if no modality with a smaller index (be it $\Diamond_i$ or ∇_i) occurs in A within the scope of a modality with a larger index.

Lemma 3.3 *Every formula* A *of* RC^∇ *is equivalent to an ordered one.*

Proof. Apply equation (1) of RC for $\Diamond$ and for ∇ modalities, and the identities of Lemma 3.2 from left to right, until the rules are not applicable to any of the subformulas of A. $\Box$

The intended arithmetical interpretation of RC^∇ maps strictly positive formulas to Gödelian theories in $\mathfrak{G}_T$ in such a way that $\top$ corresponds to T, $\wedge$ corresponds to the union of theories, $\Diamond_n$ corresponds to R_n and ∇_n corresponds to Π_{n+1}, for each $n \in \omega$.

Definition 2 An *arithmetical interpretation in* $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_T$ is a map $*$ from strictly positive modal formulas to $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_T$ satisfying the following conditions for all $n \in \omega$:

- $\top^* = 1_T; \quad (A \wedge B)^* = (A^* \wedge_T B^*);$
- $(\diamond_n A)^* = R_n(A^*); \quad (\nabla_n A)^* = \Pi_{n+1}(A^*).$

The following result shows, as expected, that every theorem of RC^∇ represents an identity of the structure $(\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_T, \wedge_T, \{R_n, \Pi_{n+1} : n < \omega\})$.

Theorem 1 *For any formulas* A, B *of* RC^∇*, if* $A \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla} B$ *then* $A^* \vdash_T B^*$*, for all arithmetical interpretations* $*$ *in* $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_T$*.*

Proof. A proof of Theorem 1 is routine. For the axioms and rules of RC for the $\diamond$-fragment it has been carefully verified in [9]. Of the remaining axioms and rules we only treat Axiom 6 for the ∇-fragment, that is, the principle

$$\nabla_n A \wedge \nabla_m B \vdash \nabla_n (A \wedge \nabla_m B). \tag{2}$$

Consider any arithmetical interpretation $*$, and let $S = A^*$ and $U = B^*$ be the corresponding Gödelian theories (with the associated numerations σ and τ, respectively). The principle (2) is the formalization in EA of the following assertion: *For any sentence* $\pi \in \Pi_{n+1}$*, if* $S \cup \Pi_{m+1}(U) \vdash \pi$ *then* $\Pi_{n+1}(S) \cup \Pi_{m+1}(U) \vdash \pi$*.* Reasoning in EA, consider a sentence $\varphi \in \Pi_{m+1}(U)$ such that $S, \varphi \vdash \pi$. Then $S \vdash \varphi \to \pi$ and, since $\varphi \to \pi$ is logically equivalent to a Π_{n+1}-sentence, conclude $\Pi_{n+1}(S) \vdash \varphi \to \pi$. Thus, $\Pi_{n+1}(S) \cup \Pi_{m+1}(U) \vdash \pi$. $\square$

Theorem 1, together with Gödel's second incompleteness theorem, has as its corollary the following property of the logic RC^∇.

Corollary 3.4 *For all* RC^∇ *formulas* A*,* $A \nvdash_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla} \diamond_n A$*.*

A similar fact is known for GLP and can also be proved by purely modal logic means [12]. A simpler argument for RC is given in Appendix A. We will make use of Corollary 3.4 or its version for RC in the normal form theorems below.

Conjecture 1 RC^∇ *is arithmetically complete, that is, the converse of Theorem 1 also holds, provided* T *is arihmetically sound.*

4 The variable-free fragment of RC^∇

Let $\mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$ denote the set of all variable-free strictly positive formulas in the language of RC^∇ with the modalities $\{\diamond_i, \nabla_i : i \geqslant n\}$ only. We abbreviate $F \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla} \nabla_n G$ by $F \vdash_n G$ and $\nabla_n F =_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla} \nabla_n G$ by $F \equiv_n G$.

Lemma 4.1 (i) *If* $A \vdash_n B$ *and* $m < n$*, then* $A \wedge \diamond_m C \vdash_n B \wedge \diamond_m C$*;*

(ii) *If* $A \vdash_n B$ *and* $B \vdash \nabla_n C$*, then* $A \vdash \nabla_n C$*;*

(iii) *If* $A \vdash_n B$ *and* $B \vdash \diamond_n C$*, then* $A \vdash \diamond_n C$*.*

Proof. (i) $A \wedge \diamond_m C \vdash \nabla_n B \wedge \diamond_m C \vdash \nabla_n (B \wedge \diamond_m C)$.
(ii) $A \vdash \nabla_n B \vdash \nabla_n \nabla_n C \vdash \nabla_n C$;
(iii) $A \vdash \nabla_n B \vdash \nabla_n \diamond_n C \vdash \diamond_n C$. $\square$

Lemma 4.2 (i) $\diamond_i A \wedge B = \nabla_i (\diamond_i A \wedge B) \wedge B$*;*

(ii) $\nabla_i A \wedge B = \nabla_i (\nabla_i A \wedge B) \wedge B$*.*

Proof. In both (i) and (ii) the implication ($\vdash$) follows from the axiom $C \vdash \nabla_i C$. For ($\dashv$) we obtain $\nabla_i(\Diamond_i A \wedge B) \vdash \nabla_i \Diamond_i A = \Diamond_i A$ for (i) and simlarly $\nabla_i(\nabla_i A \wedge B) \vdash \nabla_i \nabla_i A = \nabla_i A$ for (ii). $\Box$

Lemma 4.3 *The set of all formulas* $\{\Diamond_n F, \nabla_n G : F, G \in \mathbb{W}_n\}$ *is linearly ordered by* $\vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla}$.

Proof. For any $F, G \in \mathbb{W}_n$ we know that either $F \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_n G$ or $G \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_n F$ or $F =_{\mathrm{RC}} G$. In the first case we obtain provably in RC^∇: $\Diamond_n F \vdash \nabla_n F \vdash \Diamond_n G \vdash \nabla_n G$. The second case is symmetrical. In the third case we obtain $\Diamond_n F = \Diamond_n G \vdash \nabla_n F = \nabla_n G$. $\Box$

Theorem 2 *For each* $A \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$ *there is a word* $W \in \mathbb{W}_n$ *such that* $A \equiv_n W$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 it is sufficient to prove the theorem for ordered formulas A. The proof goes by induction on the length of ordered A. We can also assume that the minimal modality occurring in A is $\Diamond_n$ or ∇_n. (Otherwise, prove it for the minimum $m > n$ and infer $A \equiv_n W$ from $A \equiv_m W$.) Basis of induction is trivial, consider the induction step.

Assume that the induction hypothesis holds for all formulas shorter than A. Since A is ordered, A can be written in the form

$$A = \Diamond_n A_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_n A_k \wedge \nabla_n B_1 \wedge \ldots \nabla_n B_l \wedge D,$$

where $D \in \mathbb{F}_{n+1}^\nabla$ and $A_i, B_j \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$. Since $\Diamond_n$ or ∇_n must occur in A, we know that D and each A_i, B_j are strictly shorter than A. By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 4.3 we can delete from the conjunction all but one members of the form $\Diamond_n A_i$, $\nabla_n B_j$. Thus, $A = D \wedge \Diamond_n A'$ or $A = D \wedge \nabla_n B'$, for some words $A', B' \in \mathbb{W}_n$.

Now we apply the induction hypothesis to D and obtain a word $V \in S_{n+1}$ such that $V \equiv_{n+1} D$. It follows that $D \wedge \Diamond_n A' \equiv_{n+1} V \wedge \Diamond_n A'$ and $D \wedge \nabla_n B' \equiv_{n+1} V \wedge \nabla_n B'$, by Lemma 4.1. Hence, it is sufficient to prove that, for some $W \in \mathbb{W}_n$, $V \wedge \Diamond_n A' \equiv_n W$ and similarly, for some $W \in \mathbb{W}_n$, $V \wedge \nabla_n B' \equiv_n W$.

In the first case we actually have $V \wedge \Diamond_n A' =_{\mathrm{RC}} W$, for some word W, which immediately yields the claim.

In the second case we write $B' = B_1 \Diamond_n B_2$ where $B_1 \in \mathbb{W}_{n+1}$. There are three cases to consider: (a) $B_1 \vdash \Diamond_{n+1} V$, (b) $V \vdash \Diamond_{n+1} B_1$, (c) $V = B_1$.

In case (c) by Lemma 4.2 we obtain:

$$V \wedge \nabla_n B_1 \Diamond_n B_2 = V \wedge \nabla_n (V \wedge \Diamond_n B_2) = V \wedge \Diamond_n B_2 = V \Diamond_n B_2.$$

In case (a) we show $\nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B') = \nabla_n B'$. Firstly,

$$B' \vdash \Diamond_{n+1} V \wedge \nabla_n B' \vdash \nabla_{n+1} V \wedge \nabla_n B' = \nabla_{n+1}(V \wedge \nabla_n B').$$

Hence, $\nabla_n B' \vdash \nabla_n \nabla_{n+1}(V \wedge \nabla_n B') = \nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B')$. On the other hand,

$$\nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B') \vdash \nabla_n \nabla_n B' \vdash \nabla_n B'.$$

In case (b) we show $\nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B') = \nabla_n(V \wedge \Diamond_n B_2)$ so that one can infer $\nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B') = \nabla_n V \Diamond_n B_2$. On the one hand, we have

$$\nabla_n B' = \nabla_n(B_1 \wedge \Diamond_n B_2) \vdash \nabla_n \Diamond_n B_2 = \Diamond_n B_2,$$

which implies $\nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B') \vdash \nabla_n(V \wedge \Diamond_n B_2)$. On the other hand,

$$V \wedge \Diamond_n B_2 = V \wedge \Diamond_{n+1} B_1 \wedge \Diamond_n B_2 = V \wedge \Diamond_{n+1}(B_1 \wedge \Diamond_n B_2) = V \wedge \Diamond_{n+1} B' \vdash V \wedge \nabla_n B'.$$

Hence, $\nabla_n(V \wedge \Diamond_n B_2) \vdash \nabla_n(V \wedge \nabla_n B')$. $\Box$

From Theorem 2 we obtain the following strengthening of Lemma 4.3.

Corollary 4.4 *The set of all formulas* $\{\Diamond_n F, \nabla_n G : F, G \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla\}$ *is linearly ordered by* $\vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla}$.

Corollary 4.5 *For all formulas* $A, B \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$, *either* $A \vdash \Diamond_n B$, *or* $B \vdash \Diamond_n A$, *or* $A \equiv_n B$.

Proof. Consider the words $A_1 \equiv_n A$ and $B_1 \equiv_n B$. By the linearity property for words either $A_1 \vdash \Diamond_n B_1$ or $B_1 \vdash \Diamond_n A_1$ or $A_1 = B_1$. In the first case we obtain $A \vdash \nabla_n A_1 \vdash \nabla_n \Diamond_n B_1 \vdash \Diamond_n B_1 \vdash \Diamond_n \nabla_n B \vdash \Diamond_n B$. The second case is symmetrical, the third one implies $A \equiv_n B$ immediately. □

Corollary 4.6 *For all* $A, B \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$, $\Diamond_n A \vdash \Diamond_n B$ *iff* $A \vdash \nabla_n B$.

Proof. Assume $\Diamond_n A \vdash \Diamond_n B$. By Corollary 4.5, either $A \vdash \Diamond_n B$, or $B \vdash \Diamond_n A$, or $A \equiv_n B$. In the first and the third cases we immediately have $A \vdash \nabla_n B$. In the second case we obtain $\Diamond_n A \vdash \Diamond_n B \vdash \Diamond_n \Diamond_n A$ contradicting Corollary 3.4.

In the opposite direction, if $A \vdash \nabla_n B$ then $\Diamond_n A \vdash \Diamond_n \nabla_n B \vdash \Diamond_n B$. □

Theorem 3 (weak normal forms) *Every formula* $A \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$ *is equivalent in* RC^∇ *to a formula of the form*

$$\nabla_n A_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k},$$

for some k, *where* $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ *for all* $i = n, \ldots, n+k$.

Proof. Induction on the build-up of $A \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$. We consider the following cases.

1) $A = B \wedge C$. The induction hypothesis is applicable to B and C, so it is sufficient to prove: for any $B_i, C_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ there is a word $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ such that

$$\nabla_i B_i \wedge \nabla_i C_i = \nabla_i A_i.$$

By Lemma 4.3 we can take one of B_i, C_i as A_i.

2) $A = \nabla_i B$, for some $i \geqslant n$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_i B = \nabla_i(\nabla_n B_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} B_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} B_{n+k}) = \\ = \nabla_n B_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{i-1} B_{i-1} \wedge \nabla_i(\nabla_i B_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} B_{n+k}) = \\ = \nabla_n B_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{i-1} B_{i-1} \wedge \nabla_i B'_i,\end{aligned}$$

for some $B'_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$, by Theorem 2.

3) $A = \Diamond_i B$, for some $i \geqslant n$. Then we obtain, using Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\Diamond_i B = \Diamond_i(\nabla_n B_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} B_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} B_{n+k}) = \\ = \Diamond_n B_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_{i-1} B_{i-1} \wedge \Diamond_i(\nabla_i B_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} B_{n+k}) = \\ = \nabla_n \Diamond_n B_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{i-1} \Diamond_{i-1} B_{i-1} \wedge \nabla_i \Diamond_i B'_i,\end{aligned}$$

for some $B'_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$, by Theorem 2. □

Weak normal forms are, in general, not unique. However, the following lemma shows that the "tails" of the weak normal forms are invariant (up to equivalence in RC^∇).

Lemma 4.7 *Let* $A \triangleq \nabla_n A_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ *and* $B \triangleq \nabla_n B_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} B_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_m B_m$ *be weak normal forms and* $A \vdash B$. *Then* $k \geqslant m$ *and for all* i *such that* $n \leqslant i \leqslant k$ *there holds*

(i) $\nabla_i A_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_k A_k \vdash_i \nabla_i B_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_m B_m$;

(ii) $\nabla_i A_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_k A_k \vdash \nabla_i B_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_m B_m$.

Proof. Obviously, Claim (ii) implies Claim (i). We first prove (i) and then strengthen it to (ii). For $i = n$ both claims are vacuous, so we assume $i > n$.

Denote $\overline{A_i} := \nabla_i A_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ and $\overline{B_i} := \nabla_i B_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_m B_m$. By Lemma 4.5 we have either $\overline{A_i} \vdash \Diamond_i \overline{B_i}$ or $\overline{B_i} \vdash \Diamond_i \overline{A_i}$ or $\overline{A_i} \equiv_i \overline{B_i}$. In the first and in the third case we obviously have $\overline{A_i} \vdash_i \overline{B_i}$ as required.

Assume $\overline{B_i} \vdash \Diamond_i \overline{A_i}$. Consider the formula

$$C := \Diamond_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_{i-1} A_{i-1} \wedge \overline{B_i}.$$

We show that $C \vdash \Diamond_i C$ contradicting Corollary 3.4.

Using our assumption and Lemma 3.2 (i) we obtain

$$\begin{array}{rcl} C & \vdash & \Diamond_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_{i-1} A_{i-1} \wedge \Diamond_i \overline{A_i} \\ & \vdash & \Diamond_i (\nabla_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{i-1} A_{i-1} \wedge \overline{A_i}) \\ & \vdash & \Diamond_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_{i-1} A_{i-1} \wedge \Diamond_i A \\ & \vdash & \Diamond_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_{i-1} A_{i-1} \wedge \Diamond_i B \\ & \vdash & \Diamond_i (\Diamond_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \Diamond_{i-1} A_{i-1} \wedge B) \\ & \vdash & \Diamond_i C. \end{array}$$

This proves Claim (i).

To prove (ii) assume the contrary and consider the maximal number i such that $\overline{A_i} \nvdash \overline{B_i}$. Such an i exists, since both A and B have finitely many terms. Thus, we have $\overline{A_{i+1}} \vdash \overline{B_{i+1}}$ and

$$\nabla_i A_i \wedge \overline{A_{i+1}} \nvdash \nabla_i B_i \wedge \overline{B_{i+1}}.$$

It follows that $\nabla_i A_i \wedge \overline{A_{i+1}} \nvdash \nabla_i B_i = \nabla_i \nabla_i B_i$, hence $\overline{A_i} \nvdash_i \nabla_i B_i$. Since $\overline{B_i} \vdash \nabla_i B_i$, we obtain $\overline{A_i} \nvdash_i \overline{B_i}$ contradicting Claim (i). □

A corollary of Lemma 4.7 is that in every weak normal form of a given formula each tail $\nabla_i A_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ is defined uniquely up to equivalence in RC^∇.

There are two formats for graphically unique normal forms. We call them 'fat' and 'thin', because the former consist of larger expressions, whereas the latter are obtained by pruning certain parts of a given formula. Fat normal forms, presented below, have a natural proof-theoretic meaning and are tightly related to collections of proof-theoretic ordinals called *conservativity spectra* or *Turing-Taylor expansions* [22].

Definition 3 A formula $A \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$ is in the *fat normal form* if either $A \stackrel{\circ}{=} \top$ or it has the form $\nabla_n A_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}$, where for all $i = n, \ldots, n+k$, $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$, $A_{n+k} \not\stackrel{\circ}{=} \top$ and

$$\nabla_i A_i \vdash \nabla_i (\nabla_i A_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}). \qquad (*)$$

Theorem 4 (i) *Every $A \in \mathbb{F}_n^\nabla$ is equivalent to a formula in the fat normal form.*

(ii) *For any A, the words A_i in the fat normal form of A are unique modulo equivalence in* RC.

Proof. (i) First, we apply Theorem 2. Then, by induction on k we show that any formula $\nabla_n A_n \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}$ can be transformed into one satisfying $(*)$.

For $k = 0$ the claim is trivial. Otherwise, by the induction hypothesis we can assume that $(*)$ holds for $i = n+1, \ldots, n+k$. Then we argue using Lemma 4.2 as

follows:

$$\nabla_n A_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k} =$$
$$= \nabla_n(\nabla_n A_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}) \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k} =$$
$$= \nabla_n A'_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k},$$

where $A' \in \mathbb{W}_n$ is obtained from Theorem 2. Notice that

$$\nabla_n A'_n \vdash \nabla_n(\nabla_n A_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}) \vdash$$
$$\vdash \nabla_n(\nabla_n A'_n \wedge \nabla_{n+1} A_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}),$$

hence $(*)$ holds for $i = n$. This proves Claim (i).

To prove Claim (ii) we apply Lemma 4.7. Assume $A \vdash B$, $A = \nabla_n A_n \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+k} A_{n+k}$ is in the fat normal form and $B = \nabla_n B_n \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_{n+m} B_{n+m}$ is in a weak normal form. Then $k \geqslant m$ and, for all $i = n, \dots, n+m$, $\nabla_i A_i \vdash \nabla_i B_i$.

It follows that, if $A, B \in \mathbb{F}_n^{\nabla}$ are both in the fat normal form and $A = B$ in RC^{∇}, then $m = k$ and $\nabla_i A_i = \nabla_i B_i$, for $i = n, \dots, n+k$. $\square$

Corollary 4.8 *The set of variable-free sequents $A \vdash B$ provable in RC^{∇} is decidable.*

Corollary 4.9 *Suppose A, B are variable-free and T is a sound Gödelian extension of* EA. *Then $A \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} B$ iff $A^* \vdash_T B^*$, for any arithmetical interpretation $*$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_T$.*

5 Thin normal form

Let $A \stackrel{\circ}{=} \nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ be in a weak normal form. As before, we denote $\overline{A_i} \stackrel{\circ}{=} \nabla_i A_i \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$.

Definition 4 A is in a *thin normal form* if for all $i < k$ $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ is normal, $A_k \neq \top$ and there is no $B_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ such that $B_i <_i A_i$ and $\overline{A_i} =_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} \nabla_i B_i \wedge \overline{A_{i+1}}$.

This definition allows to easily prove the existence and uniqueness of normal forms using the well-known fact that words in $\mathbb{W}_i$ are well-ordered by $<_i$.

Theorem 5 *For each A there is a unique thin normal form equivalent to A.*

Proof. We recursively define the words $A_k, A_{k-1}, \dots, A_0$. To determine k and A_k one takes any weak normal form for A (since $\top$ is the $<_i$-minimum for each i). Once one has defined $A_k, \dots, A_{i+1}$ one can define A_i by considering all the weak normal forms with the given $\nabla_{i+1} A_{i+1}$, $\dots$, $\nabla_k A_k$ and selecting the one with the $<_i$-minimal A_i. By induction on $k - i$ it is also easy to see that all the words $A_k, \dots, A_0$ are thus uniquely determined. $\square$

Now we will show that the thin normal form can be effectively computed. First, we consider a particular case when the given weak normal form is $\nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B$. Then we will reduce the general case to this one.

Let $A \in \mathbb{W}_0, B \in \mathbb{W}_1, B \neq \top$ and $A \stackrel{\circ}{=} A_0 \Diamond_0 A_1 \Diamond_0 \dots \Diamond_0 A_n$ with $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_1$. If $B \vdash \nabla_0 A$ then $\nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B = \nabla_0 \top \wedge \nabla_1 B$ which is its thin normal form. So we assume $B \nvdash \nabla_0 A$. We define

$$B|A := A_i \Diamond_0 \dots \Diamond_0 A_n,$$

where i is the least such that $B \leqslant_1 A_i$. Such an i exists, for otherwise $B \vdash \Diamond_0 A \vdash \nabla_0 A$. Clearly, $B|A$ can be found effectively from A and B by deleting the

appropriate initial segment of A. Also notice that $B \wedge A =_{\mathrm{RC}} B \wedge (B|A)$. We consider three cases.

Case 1: $A_0 >_1 B$. We claim that $\nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B$ is in a thin normal form.

Assume $A' <_0 A$, then $A \vdash \diamond_1 B \wedge \diamond_0 A' = \diamond_1(B \wedge \diamond_0 A') \vdash \diamond_1(\nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B)$. Hence, if $\nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B \vdash \nabla_0 A$, then $A \vdash \diamond_1(\nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B) \vdash \diamond_1 A$ contradicting Corollary 3.4 .

Case 2: $A_0 <_1 B$. We claim that $\nabla_0 \diamond_0 (B|A) \wedge \nabla_1 B$ is the thin normal form of $\nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B$. Firstly, we show that $\diamond_0(B|A) \wedge \nabla_1 B \vdash \nabla_0 A$. By downwards induction on $j := i$ to 0 we show that

$$\diamond_0(B|A) \wedge \nabla_1 B \vdash \diamond_0(A_j \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n).$$

Basis of induction holds since $B|A = A_i \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n$. Assume the claim holds for j. Since $\nabla_1 B \vdash \nabla_1 \diamond_1 A_{j-1} = \diamond_1 A_{j-1}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \diamond_0(B|A) \wedge \nabla_1 B & \vdash & \diamond_0(A_j \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n) \wedge \nabla_1 B \\ & \vdash & \diamond_1 A_{j-1} \wedge \diamond_0(A_j \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n) \\ & \vdash & \diamond_1 A_{j-1} \diamond_0 A_j \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n, \text{since } A_{j-1} \in S_1 \\ & \vdash & \diamond_0 A_{j-1} \diamond_0 A_j \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n. \end{array}$$

Hence, the claim holds for $j-1$ and by induction we conclude that

$$\diamond_0(B|A) \wedge \nabla_1 B \vdash \diamond_0 A \vdash \nabla_0 A.$$

Now we need to show that for all $A' <_0 \diamond_0(B|A)$ one has $\nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B \nvdash \nabla_0 A$. If $\diamond_0(B|A) \vdash \diamond_0 A'$ then by Lemma 4.6 $B|A \vdash \nabla_0 A'$. Also $B|A \vdash A_i \vdash \nabla_1 B$, since we assume $B \leqslant_1 A_i$. It follows that $B|A \vdash \nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B$. On the other hand, $A \vdash \diamond_0(B|A)$ and $\nabla_0 A \vdash \diamond_0(B|A)$ whence $\nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B \nvdash \nabla_0 A$ by Corollary 3.4.

Case 3: $A_0 = B$. Let $C := A_1 \diamond_0 \dots \diamond_0 A_n$, thus $A \mathrel{\mathring{=}} B \diamond_0 C$.We claim that $\nabla_0 \diamond_0 C \wedge \nabla_1 B$ is the thin normal form of $\nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B$.

First, $\nabla_1 B \wedge \diamond_0 C \vdash \nabla_1(B \wedge \diamond_0 C) \vdash \nabla_0(B \diamond_0 C) = \nabla_0 A$. Hence, $\nabla_0 \diamond_0 C \wedge \nabla_1 B = \nabla_0 A \wedge \nabla_1 B$.

Second, we show that if $A' <_0 \diamond_0 C$ then $\nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B \nvdash \nabla_0 A$. Assume $A' <_0 \diamond_0 C$. By Lemma 4.6 we have $C \vdash \nabla_0 A'$. Also, since $A_1 \geqslant_1 B$, we have $C \vdash A_1 \vdash \nabla_1 B$ by Lemma 4.6. It follows that $C \vdash \nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B$. On the other hand, $A = B \wedge \diamond_0 C \vdash \diamond_0 C$, hence $\nabla_0 A \vdash \nabla_0 \diamond_0 C \vdash \diamond_0 C$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.4 $\nabla_0 A' \wedge \nabla_1 B \nvdash \nabla_0 A$.

In all three cases we have explicitly constructed the thin normal form. Hence, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 6 *For any variable-free formula of* RC^{∇}*, its unique thin normal form can be effectively constructed.*

Proof. Let a formula $A \mathrel{\mathring{=}} \nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ in a weak normal form be given. We argue by induction on k. For $k = 0$ the claim is obvious. Consider $k > 0$, by IH we may assume that $\overline{A_1} := \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ is in a thin normal form. (To formally apply the IH one should consider the formula obtained from $\overline{A_1}$ by decreasing all indices of modalities by 1.) By Theorem 2 there is a word $B \in S_1$ such that $\nabla_1 B \equiv_1 \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$.

Consider the formula $\nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 B$ and bring it to a thin normal form, that is, find a $<_0$-minimal $A_0' \in S_0$ such that $\nabla_0 A_0' \wedge \nabla_1 B = \nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 B$. We claim that $A' := \nabla_0 A_0' \wedge \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla_k A_k$ is equivalent to A and is in a thin normal form.

Firstly, $A' \vdash \nabla_0 A_0' \wedge \nabla_1 B \vdash \nabla_0 A_0$, hence $A' \vdash A$. On the other hand, $A \vdash \nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 B = \nabla_0 A_0'$, hence $A \vdash A'$.

Secondly, assume there is an $A'' <_0 A_0'$ such that $\nabla_0 A'' \wedge \overline{A_1} \vdash \nabla_0 A_0'$. By Lemma 4.1, $\nabla_0 A'' \wedge \overline{A_1} \equiv_1 \nabla_0 A'' \wedge \nabla_1 B$. Hence, $\nabla_0 A'' \wedge \nabla_1 B \vdash \nabla_0 A_0'$ contradicting the $<_0$-minimality of A_0'. $\square$

6 Iterating monotone operators on $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$

Transfinite iterations of reflection principles play an important role in proof theory starting from the work of A. Turing on recursive progressions [27]. Here we present a general result on defining iterations of monotone semi-idempotent operators in $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$.

An operator $R : \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}} \to \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ is called *computable* if so is the function $\ulcorner\sigma\urcorner \mapsto \ulcorner R(\sigma)\urcorner$. By extension of terminology we also call computable any operator R' such that $\forall \sigma \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}\, R'(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\sigma)$, for some computable R.

An operator $R : \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}} \to \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ is called *uniformly definable* if there is an elementary formula $\mathrm{Ax}_R(x, y)$ such that

(i) For each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ one has $R(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} \mathrm{Ax}_R(x, \overline{\ulcorner\sigma\urcorner})$,

(ii) $\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall x, y\, (\mathrm{Ax}_R(x, y) \to x \geqslant y)$.

The operators R_n and Π_{n+1} are uniformly definable in a very special way. For example, the formula $R_n(\sigma)$ is obtained by substituting $\sigma(x)$ for $X(x)$ into a fixed elementary formula containing a single positive occurrence of a predicate variable X. In fact, the following more general proposition holds that we leave here without proof. (Nothing below depends on it.)

Proposition 6.1 *An operator $R : \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}} \to \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ is uniformly definable iff R is computable.*

Definition 5 A uniformly definable R is called

- *provably monotone* if $\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall \sigma, \tau\, (\text{“}\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma\text{”} \to \text{“}R(\tau) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\sigma)\text{”})$,
- *reflexively monotone* if $\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall \sigma, \tau\, (\text{“}\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma\text{”} \to \text{“}R(\tau) \vdash R(\sigma)\text{”})$.

Here, σ, τ range over Gödel numbers of elementary formulas in one free variable, “$\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$” abbreviates $\Box_{\mathrm{EA}} \forall x\, (\Box_\tau(x) \to \Box_\sigma(x))$ and “$R(\tau) \vdash R(\sigma)$” stands for $\forall x\, (\Box_{\mathrm{Ax}_R(\cdot,\sigma)}(x) \to \Box_{\mathrm{Ax}_R(\cdot,\tau)}(x))$. Reflexivity here refers to the fact that “$R(\tau) \vdash R(\sigma)$” is the statement of inclusion of theories rather than provable inclusion. Since the formula “$\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$” implies its own provability in EA, reflexively monotone operators are (provably) monotone but not necessarily vice versa.

It is also easy to see that the operators R_n (along with all the usual reflection principles) are reflexively monotone.

An *elementary well-ordering* is a pair of bounded formulas $D(x)$ and $x \prec y$ and a constant 0 such that in the standard model the relation $\prec$ well-orders the domain D and is provably linear in EA with the least element 0. Given an elementary well-ordering $(D, \prec, 0)$, we will denote its elements by Greek letters and will identify them with an initial segment of the ordinals.

Let R be an uniformly definable monotone operator. The *α-th iterate of R along* $(D, \prec)$ is a map associating with any numeration σ the Gödelian extension of EA numerated by an elementary formula $\rho(\overline{\alpha}, x)$ such that provably in EA:

$$\rho(\alpha, x) \leftrightarrow ((\alpha = 0 \wedge \sigma(x)) \vee \exists \beta \prec \alpha\, \mathrm{Ax}_R(x, \ulcorner\rho(\bar{\beta}, x)\urcorner)). \tag{3}$$

We notice that the natural Gödel numbering of formulas and terms should satisfy the inequalities $\ulcorner\rho(\bar{\beta}, x)\urcorner \geqslant \ulcorner\bar{\beta}\urcorner \geqslant \beta$. Hence, the quantifier on β in equation (3) can be bounded by x. Thus, some elementary formula $\rho(\alpha, x)$ satisfying (3) can always be constructed by the fixed point lemma.

The parametrized family of theories numerated by $\rho(\alpha, x)$ will be denoted $R^\alpha(\sigma)$ and the formula $\rho(\alpha, x)$ will be more suggestively written as $x \in R^\alpha(\sigma)$. Then, equation (3) can be interpreted as saying that $R^0(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$ and, if $\alpha \succ 0$,

$$R^\alpha(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} \bigcup\{R(R^\beta(\sigma)) : \beta \prec \alpha\}.$$

Lemma 6.2 *Suppose R is uniformly definable.*

(i) *If $0 \prec \alpha \preceq \beta$ then $R^\beta(\sigma) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R^\alpha(\sigma)$;*

(ii) $\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall \alpha, \beta\, (0 \prec \alpha \prec \beta \to$ *"*$R^\beta(\sigma) \vdash R^\alpha(\sigma)$*"*$)$.

Proof. Obviously, Claim (i) follows from Claim (ii). For the latter we unwind the definition of $\rho(\alpha, x)$ and prove within EA

$$\forall \alpha, \beta\, (0 \prec \alpha \prec \beta \to \forall x\, (\rho(\alpha, x) \to \rho(\beta, x)).$$

This is sufficient to obtain from the same premise $\forall x\, (\Box_{\rho(\alpha,\cdot)}(x) \to \Box_{\rho(\beta,\cdot)}(x))$.

Reason within EA: If $\rho(\alpha, x)$ and $\alpha \neq 0$ then there is a $\gamma \prec \alpha$ such that $\mathrm{Ax}_R(x, \ulcorner \rho(\overline{\gamma}, x) \urcorner)$. By the provable transitivity of $\prec$ from $\alpha \prec \beta$ we obtain $\gamma \prec \beta$, hence $\rho(\beta, x)$. $\Box$

Lemma 6.3 *Suppose R is reflexively monotone. If $\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$ then $R^\alpha(\tau) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R^\alpha(\sigma)$. Moreover,* $\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall \alpha$ *"*$R^\alpha(\tau) \vdash R^\alpha(\sigma)$*"*.

Proof. We argue by reflexive induction similarly to [4], that is, we prove that

$$\forall \beta \prec \alpha\, \Box_{\mathrm{EA}} \forall x\, (\Box_{R^{\overline{\beta}}(\sigma)}(x) \to \Box_{R^{\overline{\beta}}(\tau)}(x)) \to \forall x\, (\Box_{R^\alpha(\sigma)}(x) \to \Box_{R^\alpha(\tau)}(x))$$

and then apply Löb's theorem in EA.

Reason within EA: If $\Box_{R^\alpha(\sigma)}(x)$ then either $\alpha = 0 \wedge \Box_\sigma(x)$, or there is a $\beta \prec \alpha$ such that $\Box_{R(R^{\overline{\beta}}(\sigma))}(x)$. In the first case we obtain $\Box_\tau(x)$ by the assumption $\tau \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$ and are done. In the second case, by the premise and the reflexive monotonicity of R we obtain $\Box_{R(R^{\overline{\beta}}(\tau))}(x)$ which yields $\Box_{R^\alpha(\tau)}(x)$. $\Box$

Corollary 6.4 *The iteration of R along $(D, \prec)$ is uniquely defined, that is, equation (3) has a unique solution modulo $=_{\mathrm{EA}}$.*

The following corollary is most naturally stated for elementary well-orderings equipped with an elementary successor function $\alpha \mapsto \alpha + 1$ such that provably in EA

$$\forall \alpha\, (\alpha \prec \alpha + 1 \wedge \forall \beta \prec \alpha + 1\, (\alpha \prec \beta \vee \alpha = \beta)).$$

Corollary 6.5 *Suppose R is provably monotone and semi-idempotent. Then*

(i) $R^0(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} \sigma$,

(ii) $R^{\alpha+1}(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} R(R^\alpha(\sigma))$,

(iii) $R^\lambda(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}} \bigcup\{R^\alpha(\sigma) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ *if* $\lambda \in \mathrm{Lim}$.

Proof. For Claim (ii), the implication $R^{\alpha+1}(\sigma) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(R^\alpha(\sigma))$ easy, since provably $\alpha \prec \alpha + 1$. For the opposite implication it is sufficient to prove

$$\mathrm{EA} \vdash \forall x\, (x \in R^{\alpha+1}(\sigma) \to \Box_{R(R^\alpha(\sigma))}(x)).$$

Then one will be able to conclude (within $\mathrm{EA} + B\Sigma_1$) that $\forall x\, (\Box_{R^{\alpha+1}(\sigma)}(x) \to \Box_{R(R^\alpha(\sigma))}(x))$ and then appeal to the Π^0_2-conservativity of $B\Sigma_1$ over EA.

Reason in EA: Assume $x \in R^{\alpha+1}(\sigma)$ then (since $\alpha + 1 \neq 0$) there is a $\beta \prec \alpha + 1$ such that $x \in R(R^\beta(\sigma))$. If $\beta = \alpha$ then $x \in R(R^\alpha(\sigma))$ and we are done. Otherwise, $\beta \prec \alpha$ and we consider two cases.

If $\beta \succ 0$ then we have $R^\alpha(\sigma) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R^\beta(\sigma)$ by Lemma 6.2 (ii). By the provable monotonicity of R we obtain $R(R^\alpha(\sigma)) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(R^\beta(\sigma))$, whence $\Box_{R(R^\alpha(\sigma))}(x)$.

If $\beta = 0$ then $x \in R(\sigma)$. We have $R^\alpha(\sigma) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\sigma)$, since $\alpha \succ 0$. Hence, $R(R^\alpha(\sigma)) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(R(\sigma)) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}} R(\sigma)$ by the semi-idempotence of R. So, from $x \in R(\sigma)$ we infer $\Box_{R(R^\alpha(\sigma))}(x)$. $\Box$

Below we will also need the following lemma concerning the iterations of the reflection operators R_n on $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$.

Lemma 6.6 *Let $(D, \prec)$ be an elementary well-ordering, then for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$ there holds*

$$\forall \alpha \succ 0 \;\; R^{\alpha}_{n+1}(\sigma_1) \wedge R_n(\sigma_2) =_{\mathrm{EA}} R^{\alpha}_{n+1}(\sigma_1 \wedge R_n(\sigma_2)).$$

Proof. The proof is routine by reflexive induction on α using the RC-identity

$$R_{n+1}(\sigma_1) \wedge R_n(\sigma_2) =_{\mathrm{EA}} R_{n+1}(\sigma_1 \wedge R_n(\sigma_2)).$$

□

7 Expressibility of iterated reflection

In this section we confuse the arithmetical and reflection calculus notation. We write $\Diamond_n$ for R_n and ∇_n for Π_{n+1}. Our goal is to show that iterated operators $\Diamond^{\alpha}_n$, for natural ordinal notations $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$, are expressible in the language of RC^{∇}. We will rely on the so-called *reduction property* (cf. [5], the present version is somewhat more general and follows from [4, Theorem 2], see also [11]).

We write $\Diamond_{n,\sigma}(\tau)$ for $\Diamond_n(\sigma \wedge \tau)$, hence $\Diamond_{n,\sigma}$ is a monotone semi-idempotent operator, for each σ. Let EA^+ denote the theory $R_1(\mathrm{EA})$ which is known to be equivalent to EA + Supexp.

Theorem 7 *For all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}}$, $n \in \omega$,*

$$\Diamond^{\omega}_{n,\sigma}(1) =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \nabla_n \Diamond_{n+1}(\sigma).$$

We also remak that the theory $\Diamond^{\omega}_{n,\sigma}(1)$ is equivalent to the one axiomatized over EA by the set $\bigcup\{Q^k_n(\sigma) : k < \omega\}$, where $Q^0_n(\sigma) := \Diamond_n\sigma$ and $Q^{k+1}_n(\sigma) := \Diamond_n(\sigma \wedge Q^k_n(\sigma))$ are formulas in one variable expressible in RC.

Concerning these formulas we note three well-known facts.

Lemma 7.1 *Provably in* EA*,*

1. $\forall B \in \mathbb{W}_n \, \forall k \, Q^{k+1}_n(B) \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} Q^k_n(B) \wedge \Diamond_n Q^k_n(B)$*;*
2. $\forall B \in \mathbb{W}_n \, \forall k \, Q^k_n(B) <_n \Diamond_{n+1} B$*;*
3. $\forall B \in \mathbb{W}_n \, \forall k \, \exists A \in \mathbb{W}_n \, Q^k_n(B) =_{\mathrm{RC}} A$*.*

The first two of these claims are proved by an easy induction on k. The third one is a consequence of a more general theorem that any variable-free formula of RC is equivalent to a word. An explicit rule for calculating such an A is also well-known and related to the so-called *Worm sequence*, see [6, Lemma 5.9].

We consider the set of words $(\mathbb{W}_n, <_n)$ modulo equivalence in RC, together with its natural representation in EA, as an elementary well-ordering. For each $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$, let $o_n(A)$ denote the order type of $\{B <_n A : B \in \mathbb{W}_n\}$ modulo $=_{\mathrm{RC}}$. In a formalized context, the ordinal $o_n(A)$ is represented by its notation, the word A, however we still write $o_n(A)$, as it reminds us that A must be viewed as an ordinal.

From the reduction property we obtain the following theorem that was stated in [5] in a somewhat more restricted way.

Theorem 8 *For all words $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$, in $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_{\mathrm{EA}^+}$ there holds*

$$\nabla_n A^*_{\sigma} =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \Diamond^{o_n(A)}_{n,\sigma}(1).$$

Theorem 6 of [5] used extensions of σ rather than extensions of EA^+ by iterated reflection principles and as a result involved unnecessary restrictions of the complexity of σ. However, the idea of the present proof is the same.

Proof. We argue by reflexive induction in EA^+ and prove that, for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}^+}$ and all $n < \omega$,

$$\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall B <_n A \text{ “}\nabla_n B^*_\sigma =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \Diamond^{o_n(B)}_{n,\sigma}(1)\text{”} \to \text{“}\nabla_n A^*_\sigma = \Diamond^{o_n(A)}_{n,\sigma}(1)\text{”}.$$

Arguing inside EA^+, we will omit the quotation marks and read the expression $\tau = \nu$ as $\forall x\, (\Box_\tau(x) \leftrightarrow \Box_\nu(x))$.

If $A \mathrel{\mathring{=}} \top$ the claim amounts to $\nabla_n 1 = 1$.

If $A \mathrel{\mathring{=}} \Diamond_n B$ then $o_n(A) = o_n(B)+1$, hence by the reflexive induction hypothesis $\nabla_n B^*_\sigma =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \Diamond^{o_n(B)}_{n,\sigma}(1)$. It follows that $\Diamond_{n,\sigma}(\Diamond^{o_n(B)}_{n,\sigma}(1)) = \Diamond_{n,\sigma}\nabla_n B^*_\sigma = \Diamond_{n,\sigma} B^*_\sigma$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\Diamond^{o_n(A)}_{n,\sigma}(1) = \Diamond_{n,\sigma}(\Diamond^{o_n(B)}_{n,\sigma}(1)) = \Diamond_{n,\sigma} B^*_\sigma = A^*_\sigma = \nabla_n A^*_\sigma.$$

If $A \mathrel{\mathring{=}} \Diamond_{m+1} B$ with $m \geqslant n$ then $\nabla_n A^*_\sigma = \nabla_n \nabla_m \Diamond_{m+1,\sigma} B^*_\sigma$. By the reduction property $\nabla_m \Diamond_{m+1,\sigma} B^*_\sigma = \bigcup_{k<\omega} (Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma$. Moreover, by Lemma 7.1 (i), if a sentence is provable in $\bigcup_{k<\omega}(Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma$, it must be provable in $(Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma$, for some $k < \omega$. Hence, we can infer

$$\nabla_n A^*_\sigma = \nabla_n \bigcup_{k<\omega} (Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma = \bigcup_{k<\omega} \nabla_n (Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma = \bigcup_{k<\omega} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} (Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma.$$

By Lemma 7.1(ii) and (iii), each of $Q^k_m(B)$ is $<_n$-below $A \mathrel{\mathring{=}} \Diamond_{m+1} B$ and is equivalent to a word in $\mathbb{W}_n$. Hence,

$$\bigcup_{C<_n A} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma \vdash \bigcup_{k<\omega} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} (Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma.$$

By the reflexive induction hypothesis, for each $C <_n A$ we have

$$\Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma = \Diamond_{n,\sigma} \nabla_n C^*_\sigma = \Diamond_{n,\sigma} \Diamond^{o_n(C)}_{n,\sigma}(1).$$

It follows that

$$\Diamond^{o_n(A)}_{n,\sigma}(1) = \bigcup_{C<_n A} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} \Diamond^{o_n(C)}_{n,\sigma}(1) = \bigcup_{C<_n A} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma \vdash \\ \vdash \bigcup_{k<\omega} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} (Q^k_m(B))^*_\sigma = \nabla_n A^*_\sigma.$$

On the other hand, if $C <_n A$ then $A^*_\sigma \vdash \Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma$ and $\nabla_n A^*_\sigma \vdash \nabla_n \Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma \vdash \Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma$. Hence,

$$\nabla_n A^*_\sigma \vdash \bigcup_{C<_n A} \Diamond_{n,\sigma} C^*_\sigma = \Diamond^{o_n(A)}_{n,\sigma}(1).$$

Thus, we have proved $\nabla_n A^*_\sigma = \Diamond^{o_n(A)}_{n,\sigma}(1)$, as required. □

For ordinals $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$, let $A^n_\alpha \in \mathbb{W}_n$ denote a canonical notation for α in the system $(\mathbb{W}_n, <_n)$. Thus, $o_n(A^n_\alpha) = \alpha$. We are going to show that the operations $\Diamond^\alpha_n$ are expressible in RC^∇ in the following sense.

Theorem 9 *For each $n < \omega$ and $0 < \alpha < \epsilon_0$ there is an* RC*-formula $A(p)$ such that $\forall \sigma \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}^+}\ \Diamond^\alpha_n(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \nabla_n A(\sigma)$.*

Note that $A(\sigma)$ denote the interpretation of the formula $A[p/\top]$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}_{\mathrm{EA}^+}$ sending p to σ. The theorem follows from the following main lemma.

Lemma 7.2 *For all $n < \omega$ and $\alpha < \epsilon_0$, for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathrm{EA}^+}$,*

$$\Diamond^\alpha_n \Diamond_n(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \nabla_n A^n_\alpha \Diamond_n(\sigma).$$

The proof relies on a few observations.

Lemma 7.3 *Suppose* $\Diamond_n\sigma \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \sigma$. *Then, for all* $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$,

(i) $A(\sigma) \vdash_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \sigma$;

(ii) $A^*_\sigma =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} A(\sigma)$;

(iii) $\forall m \geqslant n\, \forall \alpha < \varepsilon_0\ \Diamond^\alpha_{m,\sigma} 1 =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} \Diamond^\alpha_m(\sigma)$.

Proof. Claim (i) is proved by induction on the build-up of A. Claim (ii) follows from (i), since $\Diamond_{m,\sigma}\tau = \Diamond_m(\sigma \wedge \tau) = \Diamond_m\tau$, if $\tau \vdash \sigma$. Claim (iii) is proved by reflexive induction using the same observation as in (i) and (ii). □

Proof of Theorem 9. We observe that the formula $\Diamond_n\sigma$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 7.3. Let $B := A^n_\alpha$, then by Theorem 8

$$\nabla_n B(\Diamond_n\sigma) = \nabla_n B^*_{\Diamond_n\sigma}(1) = \Diamond^{o_n(B)}_{n,\Diamond_n\sigma}(1) = \Diamond^{o_n(B)}_n \Diamond_n\sigma.$$

However, $o_n(B) = \alpha$ and the claim follows.

8 Proof-theoretic Π^0_{n+1}-ordinals and conservativity spectra

Let S be a Gödelian extension of EA and $(\Omega, <)$ a elementary recursive well-ordering. In this section we additionally assume that Ω is an epsilon number and is equipped with elementary terms representing the ordinal constants and functions $0, 1, +, \cdot, \omega^x$. These functions should provably in EA satisfy some minimal natural axioms NWO listed in [3]. We call such well-orderings *nice*. Recall the following definitions from [5]:

- Π^0_{n+1}-*ordinal of* S, denoted $\mathrm{ord}_n(S)$, is the supremum of all $\alpha \in \Omega$ such that $S \vdash R^\alpha_n(\mathrm{EA})$;
- S is Π^0_{n+1}-*regular* if S is Π^0_{n+1}-conservative over $R^\alpha_n(\mathrm{EA})$, for some $\alpha \in \Omega$.

We refer the readers to [5] or [10] for an extended discussion of proof-theoretic Π^0_{n+1} ordinals. In this paper we consider the sequences of Π^0_{n+1}-ordinals associated with a given system.

Definition 6 *Conservativity spectrum of* S is the sequence $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)$ such that $\alpha_i = \mathrm{ord}_i(S)$.

Here are some examples of theories and their spectra:

1. $I\Sigma_1$: $(\omega^\omega, \omega, 1, 0, 0, \dots)$; $\quad$ PRA : $(\omega^\omega, \omega, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$;
2. PA : $(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, \dots)$; $\quad$ $\mathsf{PA} + \mathrm{Con}(\mathsf{PA})$: $(\varepsilon_0 \cdot 2, \varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, \dots)$
3. $\mathsf{PA} + PH$: $\quad (\varepsilon_0^2, \varepsilon_0 \cdot 2, \varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, \dots)$.

Let us call an arithmetical theory S *bounded* if S is contained in a consistent finitely axiomatizable theory. The unboundedness theorem by Kreisel and Lévy [24] yields that $\mathrm{ord}_n(S) = 0$, for all sufficiently large $n \in \omega$, whenever S is bounded. In addition we note the following property.

Proposition 8.1 *For any* S *and a nice well-ordering* Ω, *for all* $n \in \omega$,

(i) $\mathrm{ord}_{n+1}(S) \leqslant \ell(\mathrm{ord}_n(S))$;

(ii) *If* S *is* Π^0_{n+1}*-regular, then* $\mathrm{ord}_{n+1}(S) = \ell(\mathrm{ord}_n(S))$.

Proof. For (i) let $\vec{\alpha}$ denote the conservativity spectrum of S and assume $\alpha_{n+1} > \ell(\alpha_n)$. Select a γ such that $\alpha_n = \gamma + \omega^{\ell(\alpha_n)}$. Notice that

$$S \vdash R^{\alpha_{n+1}}_{n+1}(1) \wedge R^{\gamma+1}_n(1).$$

Then by Lemma 6.6 we obtain

$$R^{\alpha_{n+1}}_{n+1}(1) \wedge R^{\gamma+1}_n(1) =_{\mathrm{EA}} R^{\alpha_{n+1}}_{n+1}(R^{\gamma+1}_n(1)).$$

By Theorem 3 of [5] we have:

$$\forall \beta \in \Omega \;\; \mathit{\Pi}_{n+1} R^{\beta}_{n+1}(\sigma) =_{\mathrm{EA}^+} R^{\omega^\beta}_n(\sigma),$$

for all σ Π_{n+1}-axiomatized extensions of EA. Hence,

$$S \vdash R^{\alpha_{n+1}}_{n+1}(R^{\gamma+1}_n(1)) \vdash R^{\gamma+\omega^{\alpha_{n+1}}}_n(1).$$

It follows that $\alpha_n = \mathrm{ord}_n(S) \geqslant \gamma + \omega^{\alpha_{n+1}}$. On the other hand, by our assumption $\gamma + \omega^{\alpha_{n+1}} > \gamma + \omega^{\ell(\alpha_n)} = \alpha_n$, a contradiction.

If S is Π^0_{n+1}-regular, then $\mathit{\Pi}_{n+1}(S) = \mathit{\Pi}_{n+1} R^{\alpha}_n(1)$ where $\alpha = \mathrm{ord}_n(S)$. □

9 Kripke incompleteness of RC^∇

Kripke frames and models are understood in this paper in the usual sense. A *Kripke frame* $\mathcal{W}$ for the language of RC^∇ consists of a non-empty set W equipped with a family of binary relations $\{R_n, S_n : n \in \omega\}$.

A *Kripke model* is a Kripke frame $\mathcal{W}$ together with a *valuation* $v : W \times \mathrm{Var} \to \{0, 1\}$ assigning a truth value to each propositional variable at every node of $\mathcal{W}$. As usual, we write $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash A$ to denote that a formula A is true at a node x of a model $\mathcal{W}$. This relation is inductively defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash p \iff v(x, p) = 1$, for each $p \in \mathrm{Var}$;
- $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash \top$; $\quad \mathcal{W}, x \Vdash A \wedge B \iff (\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash A$ and $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash B)$;
- $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash \Diamond_n A \iff \exists y\, (xR_n y$ and $\mathcal{W}, y \Vdash A)$;
- $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash \nabla_n A \iff \exists y\, (xS_n y$ and $\mathcal{W}, y \Vdash A)$.

A formula A is *valid in a Kripke frame* $\mathcal{W}$ if $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash A$, for each $x \in W$ and each valuation v on $\mathcal{W}$. The following lemma is standard and easy.

Lemma 9.1 *A Kripke frame* $\mathcal{W}$ *validates all theorems of* RC^∇ *iff the following conditions hold, for all* $m, n < \omega$*:*

(i) R_n *is transitive;* $R_n \subseteq R_m$ *if* $m < n$*;* $R_n^{-1} R_m \subseteq R_m$ *if* $m < n$*;*

(ii) S_n *is transitive, reflexive;* $S_n \subseteq S_m$ *if* $m < n$*;* $S_n^{-1} S_m \subseteq S_m$ *if* $m < n$*;*

(iii) $R_n \subseteq S_n$*;* $S_n R_m \subseteq R_m$*,* $R_m S_n \subseteq R_m$ *if* $m \leqslant n$.

By the following proposition RC^∇ turns out to be incomplete w.r.t. its Kripke frames.

Proposition 9.2 *The sequent*

$$\Diamond_1 A \wedge \nabla_0 B \vdash \Diamond_1(A \wedge \nabla_0 B) \qquad (*)$$

is valid in every Kripke frame satisfying RC^∇*. However, it is unprovable in* RC^∇ *(and arithmetically invalid).*

Proof. Firstly, it is easy to see that conditions $R_1 \subseteq S_1$ and $S_1^{-1}S_0 \subseteq S_0$ imply $R_1^{-1}S_0 \subseteq S_0$. Therefore, $(*)$ holds in each Kripke frame of RC^∇.

Secondly, take $\top$ for A and $\Diamond_1\top$ for B. The left hand side is RC^∇-equivalent to $\Diamond_1\top$. The right hand side is equivalent to $\Diamond_1(\top \wedge \nabla_0\Diamond_1\top) =_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla} \Diamond_1\top \wedge \Diamond_0\Diamond_1\top$, by Lemma 3.2(i). By Corollary 3.4, $\Diamond_1\top \not\leftarrow_{\mathrm{RC}^\nabla} \Diamond_0\Diamond_1\top$. Hence, $(*)$ is unprovable in RC^∇. □

By Theorem 3 of [1], a normal strictly positive logic is a fragment of some normal modal logic if and only if it is Kripke complete. Hence, we obtain

Corollary 9.3 RC^∇ *is not a strictly positive fragment of any normal modal logic.*

10 A universal algebra for the variable-free fragment of RC^∇

In this and the following section we characterize in several ways the Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra of the variable-free fragment of RC^∇. It turns out that this structure is tightly related to the so-called *Ignatiev's* Kripke frame. This frame, denoted here $\mathcal{I}$, has been introduced by Konstantin Ignatiev [19] as a universal frame for the variable-free fragment of Japaridze's logic GLP. Later this frame has been slightly modified and studied in more detail in [12, 18]. Ignatiev's frame can be described constructively as follows.

Let $\bar{I}$ denote the set of all ω-sequences of ordinals $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots)$ such that $\alpha_i \leqslant \varepsilon_0$ and $\alpha_{i+1} \leqslant \ell(\alpha_i)$, for all $i \in \omega$. Here, the function ℓ is defined by: $\ell(\beta) = 0$ if $\beta = 0$, and $\ell(\beta) = \gamma$ if $\beta = \delta + \omega^\gamma$, for some δ, γ. Thus, all sequences of $\bar{I}$, with the exception of identically ε_0, are eventually zero. Relations R_n on $\bar{I}$ are defined by:

$$\vec{\alpha} R_n \vec{\beta} \iff (\forall i < n\ \alpha_i = \beta_i \text{ and } \alpha_n > \beta_n).$$

The structure $\overline{\mathcal{I}} = (\bar{I}, (R_n)_{n\in\omega})$ is called *the extended Ignatiev frame.* The Ignatiev frame is its restriction to the subset I of all sequences $\vec{\alpha} \in \bar{I}$ such that $\forall i \in \omega\, \alpha_i < \varepsilon_0$. The set of sequences $\vec{\alpha} \in I$ such that $\forall i < \omega\ \alpha_{i+1} = \ell(\alpha_i)$ is called *the main axis* of $\mathcal{I}$ and is denoted $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$. The points of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ correspond to words in the following way (cf [18, Lemma 3.8]).

Lemma 10.1 *For every word $A \in \mathbb{W}_0$ there is a unique $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ such that, for all $\vec{\beta} \in \overline{\mathcal{I}}$, $\overline{\mathcal{I}}, \vec{\beta} \Vdash A$ iff $\forall i \in \omega\ \alpha_i \leqslant \beta_i$.*

The unique $\vec{\alpha}$ corresponding to A will be denoted $\iota(A)$. Our goal is to transform $\mathcal{I}$ into an RC^∇-algebra $\mathfrak{I}$ with the same domain I, that is, into a semilattice with operators satisfying all the identities of RC^∇. We consider the set $\bar{I}$ equipped with the ordering

$$\vec{\alpha} \leqslant_\mathfrak{I} \vec{\beta} \iff \forall n \in \omega\ \alpha_n \geqslant \beta_n.$$

The structure $(\bar{I}, \leqslant_\mathfrak{I})$ can be seen as a subordering of the product ordering on the set of all ω-sequences of ordinals $\leqslant \varepsilon_0$, which we denote $\mathcal{E}$. A *cone in* $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of points $C_{\vec{\alpha}} := \{\vec{\beta} \in \mathcal{E} : \vec{\beta} \leqslant_\mathfrak{I} \vec{\alpha}\}$, for some $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}$.

A sequence $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}$ is called *bounded* if $\forall i \in \omega\, \alpha_i < \varepsilon_0$ and $\alpha_i \neq 0$ for only finitely many $i \in \omega$. Obviously, each $\vec{\alpha} \in I$ is bounded.

Lemma 10.2 *Suppose $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}$ is bounded. Then $C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$ is not empty and has a greatest point $\vec{\beta}$ w.r.t. $\leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}}$.*

Proof. Let $n \in \omega$ be the largest number such that $\alpha_n \neq 0$. Consider the sequence $\vec{\beta}$ such that $\beta_i = 0$ for all $i > n$, $\beta_n := \alpha_n$, and, for all $i < n$:

$$\beta_i := \begin{cases} \alpha_i, & \text{if } \ell(\alpha_i) \geqslant \beta_{i+1}, \\ \alpha_i + \omega^{\beta_{i+1}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $\vec{\beta}$ is the greatest point of $C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$. □

Corollary 10.3 *$(I, \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}})$ is a meet-semilattice.*

Proof. Let $\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \in I$. The sequence $\vec{\gamma} := (\max(\alpha_i, \beta_i))_{i<\omega}$ is the g.l.b. of $\vec{\alpha}$ and $\vec{\beta}$ in $\mathcal{E}$ and is bounded. By Lemma 10.2 $C_{\vec{\gamma}} \cap I$ has a greatest point, which has to be the g.l.b. of $\vec{\alpha}$ and $\vec{\beta}$ in I. □

We denote by $\wedge_{\mathfrak{I}}$ the meet operation of this semilattice. A nonempty set of the form $C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$ is called a *cone in $\mathcal{I}$*. The set of all cones in $\mathcal{I}$ ordered by inclusion is denoted $\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{I})$. The orderings $(\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{I}), \subseteq)$ and $(I, \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}})$ are isomorphic by the map $\vec{\alpha} \mapsto C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$. So, we have

Corollary 10.4 *For all $\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \in I$, $C_{\vec{\alpha} \wedge_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\beta}} \cap I = C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap C_{\vec{\beta}} \cap I$.*

The *Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra* $\mathfrak{L}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$ of the variable-free fragment of RC is defined as the set of variable-free RC-formulas modulo $=_{\mathrm{RC}}$ equipped with the operations $\wedge$ and $\diamond_n$, where we stipulate $[A] \wedge [B] := [A \wedge B]$ and $\diamond_n[A] := [\diamond_n A]$ on equivalence classes, for all $n \in \omega$.

Let $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$ denote the set $\{C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I : \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})\}$ of all cones of $\mathcal{I}$ generated by the points of the main axis. We claim that the operations $\cap$ and R_n^{-1} are correctly defined on $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$. Moreover, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 10.5 *The algebra $(\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I}); \cap, \{R_n^{-1} : n \in \omega\})$ is isomorphic to the Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra $\mathfrak{L}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$.*

Proof. Let $v : \mathbb{F} \to \mathcal{P}(I)$ denote the map associating with every variable-free formula A of RC the set of points $v(A) := \{\vec{\alpha} \in I : \mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash A\}$. By the soundness and completeness of RC w.r.t. the Ignatiev model we have $v(A) = v(B)$ iff $A =_{\mathrm{RC}} B$. Moreover, by Lemma 10.1 the range of v consists of all the cones in $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$. So, v factors to a bijective map $\bar{v} : \mathfrak{L}^0_{\mathrm{RC}} \to \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$. The operations $\cap$ and R_n^{-1} correspond to the definition of truth in a Kripke model, hence $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$ is closed under these operations and $\bar{v}$ is an isomorphism of the respective algebras. □

We now define on I the structure of an RC^{∇}-algebra.

Definition 7 For all $n \in \omega$ define the functions $\nabla_n, \diamond_n : I \to I$. For each element $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \dots)$ of I let:

$\nabla_n(\vec{\alpha}) := (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, 0, \dots)$;

$\diamond_n(\vec{\alpha}) := (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, 0, \dots)$, where $\beta_{n+1} := 0$ and $\beta_i := \alpha_i + \omega^{\beta_{i+1}}$, for all $i \leqslant n$.

The algebra $\mathfrak{I} = (I, \wedge_{\mathfrak{I}}, \{\diamond_n, \nabla_n : n \in \omega\})$ is called the *Ignatiev RC^{∇}-algebra*.

The definition of the operations $\diamond_n$ is motivated by the following lemma and its corollary.

Lemma 10.6 *Suppose $\vec{\alpha} \in I$ and $\vec{\beta} = \diamond_n(\vec{\alpha})$. Then $\vec{\beta} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ and*

(i) $C_{\vec{\beta}} = \bigcap_{i \leqslant n} R_i^{-1}(C_{\vec{\alpha}})$;

(ii) *If* $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ *then* $C_{\vec{\beta}} = R_n^{-1}(C_{\vec{\alpha}})$.

Proof. (i) It is easy to see that each of the sets $R_i^{-1}(C_{\vec{\alpha}})$, for $i \leqslant n$, is a cone in $\mathcal{I}$ generated by the bounded sequence $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_i + 1, 0, \dots)$ from $\mathcal{E}$. Hence, the intersection of these cones is a cone generated by $(\alpha_0+1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}+1, \alpha_n+1, 0, \dots)$. Its greatest element in I obviously coincides with $\diamondsuit_n(\vec{\alpha})$.

(ii) Clearly, $\vec{\beta} \in R_n^{-1}(C_{\vec{\alpha}})$, since $\vec{\beta}' := (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1}, \alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}, \dots)$ satisfies $\vec{\beta} R_n \vec{\beta}'$ and $\vec{\beta}' \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\alpha}$. In the opposite direction, show by downward induction on $i \leqslant n$ that if $\vec{\gamma} \in R_n^{-1}(C_{\vec{\alpha}})$ then $\gamma_i \geqslant \beta_i$. For $i = n$ the claim is obvious. Assume $i < n$, then $\gamma_i \geqslant \alpha_i$. Since $\ell(\gamma_i) \geqslant \gamma_{i+1} \geqslant \beta_{i+1}$ and $\ell(\alpha_i) = \alpha_{i+1} < \beta_{i+1}$, we must also have $\gamma_i \geqslant \alpha_i + \omega^{\beta_{i+1}} = \beta_i$. □

Corollary 10.7 $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$ *is isomorphic to the algebra* $(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I}), \wedge_{\mathfrak{I}}, \{\diamondsuit_n : n \in \omega\})$.

Proof. Consider the bijection $\vec{\alpha} \longmapsto C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$ from $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ to $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{I})$. By Corollary 10.4 this map preserves the meet, and by Lemma 10.6 it preserves the diamond modalities. □

Let $A^{\mathfrak{I}}$ denote the value of a variable-free RC^{∇}-formula A in $\mathfrak{I}$.

Lemma 10.8 *Let* $\vec{\alpha} = B^{\mathfrak{I}}$ *with* $B \in \mathbb{W}_0$. *Then* $\forall i \in \omega\ \alpha_i = o_i(h_i(B))$.

Proof. We argue by induction on the length of B. Let $B = \diamondsuit_n A$. For $i \leqslant n$ let $\beta_i := o_i(h_i(B))$. For $i > n$ we have $h_i(\diamondsuit_n A) = \top$, hence $\beta_i = 0$. For $i \leqslant n$ we argue by downwards induction on i. If $i = n$ then $\beta_n = o_n(h_n(A)) + 1 = \alpha_n$ by the induction hypothesis. If $i < n$ denote $A_i := h_i(A)$ and write $A_i \triangleq A_{i+1} \diamondsuit_i C$ (where the part $\diamondsuit_i C$ may be empty). Then

$$\beta_i = o_i(\diamondsuit_n A_i) = o_i(C) + \omega^{o_{i+1}(\diamondsuit_n A_{i+1})} = o_i(C) + \omega^{\beta_{i+1}}.$$

Recall that $o_i(A_i) = o_i(C) + \omega^{o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})}$ and since $o_{i+1}(\diamondsuit_n A_{i+1}) > o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})$ we have

$$\beta_i = o_i(A_i) + \omega^{\beta_{i+1}}.$$

By the induction hypothesis $o_i(A_i) = \alpha_i$, which agrees with Definition 7 and proves the induction step. □

Corollary 10.9 *Let* $\vec{\alpha} = A^{\mathfrak{I}}$ *with* $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$. *Then* $\alpha_n = o_n(A)$, $\forall i < n\ \alpha_i = \omega^{\alpha_{i+1}}$, *and* $\alpha_{i+1} = \ell(\alpha_i)$, *for all* $i > n$.

Proof. Firstly, by Definition 7 we easily obtain by induction on the length of $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$ that $\forall i \in \omega\ \alpha_{i+1} = \ell(\alpha_i)$. Secondly, by Lemma 10.8 for $i \leqslant n$ we have $\alpha_i = o_i(h_i(A)) = o_i(A) = \omega_{n-i}(o_n(A))$. □

Lemma 10.10 *For every* $\vec{\alpha} \in I$ *there is an* $\vec{\alpha}' \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ *such that* $\vec{\alpha}' \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\alpha}$ *and* $\diamondsuit_n \vec{\alpha} = \diamondsuit_n \vec{\alpha}'$ *in* $\mathfrak{I}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha'_n := \alpha_n$, $\forall i \geqslant n\ \alpha'_{i+1} := \ell(\alpha'_i)$, and $\forall i < n\ \alpha'_i := \alpha_i + \omega^{\alpha'_{i+1}}$. It is easy to check that $\vec{\alpha}'$ is as required. □

Proposition 10.11 $A \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} B$ *implies* $A^{\mathfrak{I}} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} B^{\mathfrak{I}}$.

Proof. We argue by induction on the length of RC^{∇}-derivation. In almost all the cases the proof is routine. We prove the nontrivial case of the axiom $\Diamond_n A \wedge \Diamond_m B \vdash \Diamond_n(A \wedge \Diamond_m B)$ for $m < n$. Let $\vec{\alpha} = A^{\mathfrak{I}}$ and $\vec{\beta} = B^{\mathfrak{I}}$. Using Lemma 10.10 we obtain $\vec{\alpha}', \vec{\beta}' \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ such that $\vec{\alpha}' \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\alpha}$, $\vec{\beta}' \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\beta}$ and $\Diamond_n \vec{\alpha} = \Diamond_n \vec{\alpha}'$, $\Diamond_m \vec{\beta} = \Diamond_m \vec{\beta}'$. By Corollary 10.7 together with Proposition 10.5 the algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{I})$ satisfies the identities of RC, hence we have

$$\Diamond_n \vec{\alpha}' \wedge \Diamond_m \vec{\beta}' \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \Diamond_n(\vec{\alpha}' \wedge \Diamond_m \vec{\beta}').$$

Therefore,

$$\Diamond_n \vec{\alpha} \wedge \Diamond_m \vec{\beta} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \Diamond_n(\vec{\alpha}' \wedge \Diamond_m \vec{\beta}) \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \Diamond_n(\vec{\alpha} \wedge \Diamond_m \vec{\beta}).$$

The second inequality holds by the monotonicity of $\wedge$ and $\Diamond_n$. $\square$

Lemma 10.12 *Suppose $A \stackrel{\circ}{=} \nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_n A_n$ is in the fat normal form. Then $A^{\mathfrak{I}} = (o_0(A_0), o_1(A_1), \ldots, o_n(A_n), 0, \ldots)$.*

Proof. Firstly, since each $A_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ we obtain from Corollary 10.9 that

$$(\nabla_i A_i)^{\mathfrak{I}} = (\omega_i(o_i(A_i)), \omega_{i-1}(o_i(A_i)), \ldots, \omega^{o_i(A_i)}, o_i(A_i), 0, \ldots).$$

As in Lemma 4.7 denote $\overline{A_i} := \nabla_i A_i \wedge \nabla_{i+1} A_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_n A_n$. By downwards induction on $i \leqslant n$ we show that

$$(\overline{A_i})^{\mathfrak{I}} = (\omega_i(o_i(A_i)), \omega_{i-1}(o_i(A_i)), \ldots, o_i(A_i), \ldots, o_n(A_n), 0, \ldots). \tag{4}$$

As we have noticed above, for $i = n$ the claim follows from Corollary 10.9. Assume $i < n$ and that the claim holds for $i + 1$. Since in a fat normal form

$$\nabla_i A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} \nabla_i(\nabla_i A_i \wedge \nabla_{i+1} A_{i+1}),$$

by Proposition 10.11 we obtain that the sequence $(\nabla_i A_i)^{\mathfrak{I}}$ coordinatewise majorizes the sequence $(\nabla_i(\nabla_i A_i \wedge \nabla_{i+1} A_{i+1}))^{\mathfrak{I}}$. The former has at the ordinal $o_i(A_i)$ i-th position, and the latter has the least ordinal α such that $\alpha \geqslant o_i(A_i), \omega^{o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})}$ and $\ell(\alpha) \geqslant o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})$. Therefore, $o_i(A_i) = \alpha$ and $\ell(o_i(A_i)) \geqslant o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})$.

Now consider the sequence $(\overline{A_i})^{\mathfrak{I}} = (\nabla_i A_i \wedge \overline{A_{i+1}})^{\mathfrak{I}}$. By the induction hypothesis its tail coincides with that of (4) starting from position $i + 1$. Since $\ell(o_i(A_i)) \geqslant o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})$, we also have that its i-th position is $o_i(A_i)$. For each $k < i$ we have $\omega_k(o_i(A_i)) \geqslant \omega_k(\omega^{o_{i+1}(A_{i+1})})$. It follows that the sequence $(\overline{A_i})^{\mathfrak{I}}$ coincides with (4). $\square$

Theorem 10 *For all variable-free formulas A, B, $A \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} B$ iff $A^{\mathfrak{I}} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} B^{\mathfrak{I}}$.*

Proof. We must only prove the 'only if' part. Moreover, it is sufficient to prove it for fat normal forms $A \stackrel{\circ}{=} \nabla_0 A_0 \wedge \nabla_1 A_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_n A_n$ and $B \stackrel{\circ}{=} \nabla_0 B_0 \wedge \nabla_1 B_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nabla_m B_m$. If $A^{\mathfrak{I}} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} B^{\mathfrak{I}}$ then by Lemma 10.12 we have $n \geqslant m$ and $o_i(A_i) \geqslant o_i(B_i)$, for each $i \leqslant m$. Since $A_i, B_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$, this means that $A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_i B_i$ or $A_i =_{\mathrm{RC}} B_i$. Hence, $\nabla_i A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} \nabla_i B_i$ for each $i \leqslant m$. It follows that $A \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}} B$. $\square$

The Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra of the variable-free fragment of RC^{∇} consists of the equivalence classes of variable-free RC^{∇}-formulas modulo $=_{\mathrm{RC}^{\nabla}}$. The operations $\wedge$, $\Diamond_n$, ∇_n, for all $n \in \omega$, are defined in the standard way. Theorem 10 essentially means the following.

Corollary 10.13 *The Ignatiev RC^{∇}-algebra $\mathfrak{I}$ is isomorphic to the Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra of the variable-free fragment of RC^{∇}.*

11 $\mathfrak{I}$ as the algebra of variable-free RC-theories

Another, perhaps even more natural, view of the Ignatiev RC^∇-algebra is via an interpretation of the points of $\mathcal{I}$ as variable-free RC-theories. It nicely agrees with the arithmetical interpretation in that we can also view such a theory as an arithmetical theory (every variable-free RC-formula corresponds to an arithmetical sentence). This correspondence underlies a formal definition of a map *th* from variable-free RC^∇-formulas to RC-theories below. In this section we will presuppose that the language is variable-free and will only consider variable-free formulas and theories.

A set of strictly positive formulas T is called an RC-*theory* if $B \in T$ whenever there are $A_1, \dots, A_n \in T$ such that $A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} B$. A theory T is called *improper* if T coincides with the set of all strictly positive formulas, otherwise it is called *proper*.[2] A theory is called *bounded* if there is a strictly positive formula A such that $T \subseteq \{B : A \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} B\}$. We will use the following basic fact.

The set $\bar{I}$ bears a natural topology generated as a subbase by the set of all cones in $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$ and their complements. By [18, Theorem 3.12], this topology coincides with the product topology of the space $\mathcal{E}$ induced on $\bar{I}$. Obviously, for each RC-formula A, the set $v(A)$ is clopen. Moreover, this topology is compact and totally disconnected on $\bar{I}$, since $\bar{I}$ is closed in $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ is compact by Tychonoff theorem. As a corollary we obtain the following strong completeness result.

Proposition 11.1 *Let T be an* RC-*theory and A an* RC-*formula.*

(i) *$T \nvdash_{\mathrm{RC}} A$ iff there is an $\vec{\alpha} \in \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{I}}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash T$ and $\overline{\mathcal{I}}, \vec{\alpha} \nVdash A$;*

(ii) *If T is bounded then $T \nvdash_{\mathrm{RC}} A$ iff there is an $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash T$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \nVdash A$.*

Proof. (i) The nontrivial implication is from left to right. Assume $T \nvdash_{\mathrm{RC}} A$. There is an increasing sequence of finite theories $(T_n)_{n\in\omega}$ such that $T = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} T_n$. By the completeness of the variable-free fragment of RC w.r.t. $\mathcal{I}$ each of the sets $v(T_n) \setminus v(A)$ is nonempty and clopen. By the compactness of $\bar{I}$ there is a point $\vec{\alpha} \in \bigcap_{n\in\omega} v(T_n) \setminus v(A) = v(T) \setminus v(A)$.

(ii) In case T is bounded we have $v(T) \supseteq v(B)$, for some word B. There is a bounded sequence $\vec{\beta} \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $v(T) = C_{\vec{\beta}} \cap \bar{I}$: consider the pointwise supremum of the generating points of the cones $v(T_n)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$, each of which is pointwise majorized by the greatest element $B^{\mathfrak{I}}$ of $v(B)$. By Lemma 10.2, the set $v(T)$ has a greatest point, say $\vec{\gamma} \in I$. Since $\vec{\alpha} \in v(T)$ we have $\vec{\alpha} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\gamma}$, hence $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\gamma} \nVdash A$. $\square$

For any RC-theories T, S define $T \leqslant_{\mathrm{RC}} S$ iff $T \supseteq S$. The g.l.b. of T and S in this ordering, denoted $T \wedge_{\mathrm{RC}} S$, is the theory generated by the union $T \cup S$ (this agrees with our arithmetical notation). Thus, the set $\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$ of all bounded variable-free RC-theories is a semilattice (it is, in fact, a lattice with $T \cap S$ the l.u.b. of T and S).

For each $\vec{\alpha} \in \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ define an RC-theory $[\vec{\alpha}] := \{A : \overline{\mathcal{I}}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash A\}$. Clearly, $[\vec{\alpha}]$ is bounded if $\vec{\alpha} \in I$. For each RC-theory T define $v(T) := \{\vec{\alpha} \in I : \mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash T\}$.

Proposition 11.2 (i) *The map $\vec{\alpha} \mapsto [\vec{\alpha}]$ is an isomorphism between $(\mathcal{I}, \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}})$ and the ordered set $\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$ of bounded* RC-*theories.*

(ii) *The map v is an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$ and the ordered set $(\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{I}), \subseteq)$ of cones in $\mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that

[2] We avoid the term 'consistent', for even the improper theory corresponds to a consistent set of arithmetical sentences.

(a) The maps $\vec{\alpha} \mapsto [\vec{\alpha}]$ and $T \mapsto v(T)$ are order-preserving;

(b) $\forall \vec{\alpha} \in I\ v([\vec{\alpha}]) = C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$;

(c) If $v(T) = C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$ then $T = [\vec{\alpha}]$.

Item (a) is obvious. For (b) we observe:

$$\vec{\beta} \in v([\vec{\alpha}]) \iff \forall A\, (\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash A \Rightarrow \mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \Vdash A).$$

The right hand side is equivalent to $\vec{\beta} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\alpha}$: If $\vec{\beta} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash A$ then $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \Vdash A$ by Proposition 10.1. If $\vec{\beta} \not\leqslant \vec{\alpha}$ then there is a word A such that $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash A$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \nVdash A$, by [18, Corollary 3.9]. Hence, $\vec{\beta} \in v([\vec{\alpha}])$ iff $\vec{\beta} \in C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$.

For (c) we use Proposition 11.1. Suppose $\vec{\alpha} \in I$ and $v(T) = C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$. Then $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash T$ and thus $T \subseteq [\vec{\alpha}]$. For the opposite inclusion assume $A \in [\vec{\alpha}]$ and $A \notin T$. By Proposition 11.1 there is a node $\vec{\beta} \in I$ such that $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \Vdash T$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \nVdash A$. Thus, $\vec{\beta} \in v(T)$ and, since $v(A)$ is downwards persistent, $\vec{\beta} \not\leqslant \vec{\alpha}$. It follows that $v(T) \not\subseteq C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I$. $\square$

The operations of the Ignatiev RC^{∇}-algebra can be interpreted in terms of the semilattice of bounded theories as follows. For each $T \in \mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$ let $\nabla^{\mathrm{RC}}_n T$ denote the RC-theory axiomatized by $\{\Diamond_m A : \Diamond_m A \in T \text{ and } m \leqslant n\}$.

Lemma 11.3 *For all $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{I}$, $\nabla^{\mathrm{RC}}_n([\vec{\alpha}]) = [\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}]$.*

Proof. For the inclusion ($\subseteq$) we need to show: if $m \leqslant n$ and $\Diamond_m A \in [\vec{\alpha}]$ then $\Diamond_m A \in [\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}]$. If $\Diamond_m A \in [\vec{\alpha}]$ then $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash \Diamond_m A$, hence there is a $\vec{\beta}$ such that $\vec{\alpha} R_m \vec{\beta}$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \Vdash A$. So, we have $\forall i < m\ \alpha_i = \beta_i$ and $\alpha_m > \beta_m$. Since $m \leqslant n$, the node $\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}$ has the same coordinates as $\vec{\alpha}$ for all $i \leqslant m$. Therefore, $(\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}) R_m \vec{\beta}$ and $\mathcal{I}, (\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}) \Vdash \Diamond_m A$.

For the inclusion ($\supseteq$) we consider any node $\vec{\gamma} \in I$ such that $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\gamma} \Vdash \nabla^{\mathrm{RC}}_n [\vec{\alpha}]$ and show that $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\gamma} \Vdash [\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}]$. This means that $v(\nabla^{\mathrm{RC}}_n [\vec{\alpha}]) \subseteq v([\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}])$ and hence by Proposition 11.2 $\nabla^{\mathrm{RC}}_n([\vec{\alpha}]) \supseteq [\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}]$.

Assume $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\gamma} \nVdash [\nabla_n \vec{\alpha}]$. Then there is an $m \leqslant n$ such that $\gamma_m < \alpha_m$. Consider a word $A \in \mathbb{W}_m$ such that $o_m(A) = \gamma_m$. Recall that that the point on the main axis corresponding to A is $\iota(A) = (\omega_m(\gamma_m), \dots, \omega^{\gamma_m}, \gamma_m, \ell(\gamma_m), \dots)$.

We claim that $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\gamma} \nVdash \Diamond_m A$, whereas $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash \Diamond_m A$. The former holds, since for all $\vec{\delta}$ such that $\vec{\gamma} R_m \vec{\delta}$ one has $\delta_m < \gamma_m$, hence $\vec{\delta} \not\leqslant \iota(A)$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\delta} \nVdash A$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha} \Vdash \Diamond_m A$ holds, since there is a sequence $\vec{\alpha}' := (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}, \gamma_m, \gamma_{m+1}, \dots)$ such that $\vec{\alpha} R_m \vec{\alpha}'$ and $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\alpha}' \Vdash A$.

To show that $\vec{\alpha}' \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \iota(A)$ we prove that $\forall i \leqslant m\ \omega_{m-i}(\gamma_m) \leqslant \alpha_i$ by downward induction on $i \leqslant m$. Assume the claim holds for some i such that $0 < i \leqslant m$. Then $\alpha_{i-1} \geqslant \omega^{\ell(\alpha_{i-1})} \geqslant \omega^{\alpha_i} \geqslant \omega^{\gamma_i} = \gamma_{i-1}$. $\square$

In order to define the operations $\Diamond^{\mathrm{RC}}_n$ on the set of bounded RC-theories we need a few definitions. An RC-theory T is of *level n* if T is generated by a set of formulas $\Diamond_n A$ such that $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$. A theory T is *of level at least n* if it is generated by a subset of $\mathbb{W}_n$.

Lemma 11.4 *Every bounded* RC*-theory T is representable in the form $T = T_0 \wedge_{\mathrm{RC}} T_1 \wedge_{\mathrm{RC}} \dots \wedge_{\mathrm{RC}} T_n$ where each T_i is of level i.*

Proof. Recall that every RC-formula is RC-equivalent to an ordered formula. Moreover, every variable-free RC-formula in which only the modalities $\Diamond_i$ with $i \geqslant m$ occur is equivalent to a word in $\mathbb{W}_m$. Hence, every formula is equivalent to a conjunction of formulas of the form $\Diamond_i A$ with $A \in \mathbb{W}_i$. Since T is bounded, the set

of indices of modalities occurring in the axioms of T is bounded, say by n. Hence, each axiom of T can be replaced by a finite set of formulas of various levels below n and one can partition the union of all these axioms into the disjoint subsets of the same level. □

Lemma 11.5 *For each bounded* RC*-theory T of level at least n there is an* RC*-formula $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$ such that $\nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} A = \nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} T$ holds in $\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$.*

Proof. Suppose T is of level n and $T = [\vec{\alpha}]$. We claim that

$$\forall i < n \; \alpha_i = \omega_{n-i}(\alpha_n). \tag{5}$$

If B is a formula in which only modalities $\Diamond_k$ for $k \geqslant n$ occur, then $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta} \Vdash B$ holds iff $\mathcal{I}, \vec{\beta}' \Vdash B$ where $\vec{\beta}' := (\omega_n(\beta_n), \dots, \omega_1(\beta_n), \beta_n, \beta_{n+1}, \dots)$. Moreover, for any $\vec{\gamma} \in I$ such that $\gamma_n \geqslant \beta_n$ we have $\beta'_i \leqslant \gamma_i$ for all $i < n$. Hence, if $\vec{\alpha}$ is the greatest element of $v(T)$, condition (5) must hold.

Now let $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$ be such that $o_n(A) = \alpha_n$. Then by Lemma 11.3 $\nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}}(T) = \nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}}([\vec{\alpha}]) = [\nabla_n(\vec{\alpha})]$. By (5) we have

$$\nabla_n(\vec{\alpha}) = (\omega_n(\alpha_n), \omega_{n-1}(\alpha_n), \dots, \alpha_n, 0, \dots).$$

On the other hand, if $A = [\vec{\beta}]$ then

$$\vec{\beta} = (\omega_n(\alpha_n), \omega_{n-1}(\alpha_n), \dots, \alpha_n, \ell(\alpha_n), \dots),$$

and we obtain $\nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} A = [\nabla_n(\vec{\beta})] = [(\omega_n(\alpha_n), \omega_{n-1}(\alpha_n), \dots, \alpha_n, 0, \dots)]$. Proposition 11.2 yields the result. □

Now we can give the following definition of the theory $\Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}} T$, for each bounded RC-theory T.

If T is of level at least n, we let $\Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}} T$ be the theory generated by the formula $\Diamond_n A$, where $A \in \mathbb{W}_n$ is such that $\nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} A = \nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} T$ in $\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$. (Notice that this definition is correct, since any two words A_1, A_2 satisfying $\nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} A_1 = \nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} A_2$ in $\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}$ also satisfy $\Diamond_n A_1 =_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_n A_2$.)

For each $i \leqslant n$, let T_i denote the theory (of level at least i) generated by $T \cap \mathbb{W}_i$. Then $\Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}}(T) := \Diamond_0^{\mathrm{RC}}(T_0) \wedge \Diamond_1^{\mathrm{RC}}(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}}(T_n)$.

The following lemma shows that this definition agrees with the operations on the Ignatiev algebra.

Lemma 11.6 *For all $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{I}$, $\Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}}([\vec{\alpha}]) = [\Diamond_n(\vec{\alpha})]$.*

Proof. If $T = [\vec{\alpha}]$ then, for each i, the theory $T_i := T \cap \mathbb{W}_i$ corresponds to the sequence $\vec{\alpha}' := (\omega_i(\alpha_i), \dots, \omega^{\alpha_i}, \alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots)$. In fact, $\vec{\alpha} \leqslant_{\mathfrak{I}} \vec{\alpha}'$ and $\vec{\alpha}'$ is of level at least n. Moreover, $\vec{\alpha}'$ is the greatest element of level at least n above $\vec{\alpha}$. It follows that $\Diamond_i^{\mathrm{RC}} T_i = \Diamond_i A_i$ where A_i corresponds to $(\omega_i(\alpha_i), \dots, \omega^{\alpha_i}, \alpha_i, \ell(\alpha_i), \dots)$, whence

$$\Diamond_i^{\mathrm{RC}} T_i = [(\omega_i(\alpha_i + 1), \dots, \omega^{\alpha_i + 1}, \alpha_i + 1, 0, \dots)].$$

Then we observe that $\Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}}(T) = \Diamond_0^{\mathrm{RC}}(T_0) \wedge \Diamond_1^{\mathrm{RC}}(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}}(T_n)$ corresponds to the cone generated by the following sequence in $\mathcal{E}$: $(\alpha_0 + 1, \alpha_1 + 1, \dots, \alpha_n + 1, 0, \dots)$ which coincides with the cone of $\Diamond_n(\vec{\alpha})$ (cf Lemma 10.6). □

Using Lemma 10.6 we can also isomorphically represent $\mathfrak{I}$ as an algebra of cones of I. Let $\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{I})$ denote the set of all cones in $\mathcal{I}$. Given a cone C let $\Diamond_n^{\mathfrak{C}}(C) := \bigcap_{i \leqslant n} R_i^{-1}(C)$. We also define

$$\nabla_n^{\mathfrak{C}}(C) := \bigcap \{R_i^{-1}(D) : D \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{I}), \; i \leqslant n, \; R_i^{-1}(D) \supseteq C\}.$$

Notice that, for all $\vec{\alpha} \in I$, $\Diamond_n^{\mathfrak{C}}(C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I) = C_{\Diamond_n(\vec{\alpha})} \cap I$ by Lemma 10.6 (i). On the other hand, $\nabla_n^{\mathfrak{C}}(C_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap I) = v(\nabla_n([\vec{\alpha}]))$. We summarize the information in the following theorem.

Theorem 11 *The following structures are isomorphic:*

(i) *The Lindenbaum–Tarski algebra of the variable-free fragment of* RC^{∇}*;*

(ii) $\mathfrak{I} = (I, \wedge_{\mathfrak{I}}, \{\Diamond_n, \nabla_n : n \in \omega\})$*;*

(iii) $(\mathfrak{T}^0_{\mathrm{RC}}, \wedge_{\mathrm{RC}}, \{\Diamond_n^{\mathrm{RC}}, \nabla_n^{\mathrm{RC}} : n \in \omega\})$*;*

(iv) $(\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{I}), \cap, \{\Diamond_n^{\mathfrak{C}}, \nabla_n^{\mathfrak{C}} : n \in \omega\})$.

A Irreflexivity of $<_0$ in RC

We work in (the variable-free fragment of) the reflection calculus RC. We will use the techniques of Kripke models for RC. The notions of the *canonical tree* for a formula A, its *RC-closure* $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ and that of an *RC-model* are defined in [9].

Lemma A.1 *Any variable-free formula of* RC *is equivalent to* $\top$ *or to a formula of the form* $A \triangleq \bigwedge_{i \leqslant k} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i$ *where*

(i) $A_i \in \mathbb{F}_{m_i}$*, for each* i*;*

(ii) $m_0 > m_1 > \cdots > m_k$*;*

(iii) $\Diamond_{m_i} A_i \nvdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_{m_j} A_j$*, for all* $j > i$.

Such formulas are called *properly ordered*. If A is properly ordered, then $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ can be characterized as follows.

If $A \triangleq \top$ then $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ is the irreflexive singleton frame. If $A \triangleq \bigwedge_{i \leqslant k} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i$ then $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ consists of the disjoint union of the frames $\mathrm{RC}[A_i]$, for all $i \leqslant k$, augmented by a new root a. In addition to all the relations inherited from the frames $\mathrm{RC}[A_i]$, the following relations are postulated:

1. $aR_n x$, for each $i \leqslant k$, $n \leqslant m_i$ and $x \in \mathrm{RC}[A_i]$;
2. $xR_n y$, for each $i \leqslant k$, $n < m_i$, and $x, y \in \bigcup_{j \leqslant i} \mathrm{RC}[A_j]$;
3. $xR_n y$, for each $i \leqslant k$, $n \leqslant m_i$, $y \in \mathrm{RC}[A_i]$ and $x \in \bigcup_{j < i} \mathrm{RC}[A_j]$.

The following lemma is routine.

Lemma A.2 $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ *thus described is an RC-model.*

Theorem 12 *For any formula* A *of* RC*,* $A \nvdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_0 A$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the claim for variable-free and properly ordered A. For such an A, we argue by induction on the length of A. Basis is trivial. Suppose $A = \bigwedge_{i \leqslant k} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i$. If $A \vdash \Diamond_0 A$ then there is a homomorphism f of $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ into itself such that $aR_0 f(a)$. Then there is an $i \leqslant k$ such that $f(a) \in \mathrm{RC}[A_i]$.

Let X denote the subset of $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ corresponding to $\mathrm{RC}[A_i]$. Consider any $n \geqslant m_i$ and an R_n-arrow whose source is in X. By the construction of $\mathrm{RC}[A]$, this arrow can only be an old arrow from the frame $\mathrm{RC}[A_i]$. Hence, the target of this arrow will also be in X. Since $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_{m_i}$, it follows that $f(X \cup \{a\}) \subseteq X$. The subset $X \cup \{a\}$ together with all the inherited relations can be considered as a submodel of $\mathrm{RC}[A]$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{RC}[\Diamond_{m_i} A_i]$. Hence, f induces a homomorphism $f : \mathrm{RC}[\Diamond_{m_i} A_i] \to \mathrm{RC}[A_i]$. This implies that either $A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i$ (if $f(a)$ is the root of $\mathrm{RC}[A_i]$), or $A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_{m_i} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i$ (if $f(a)$ is strictly above the root). In any case $A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_{m_i} A_i \vdash_{\mathrm{RC}} \Diamond_0 A_i$ contradicting the induction hypothesis. □

References

[1] L. Beklemishev. A note on strictly positive logics and word rewriting systems. Preprint ArXiv:1509.00666 [math.LO], 2015.

[2] L. D. Beklemishev and A. A. Onoprienko. On some slowly terminating term rewriting systems. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 206:1173–1190, September 2015.

[3] L.D. Beklemishev. Iterated local reflection versus iterated consistency. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 75:25–48, 1995.

[4] L.D. Beklemishev. Proof-theoretic analysis by iterated reflection. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 42:515–552, 2003. DOI: 10.1007/s00153-002-0158-7.

[5] L.D. Beklemishev. Provability algebras and proof-theoretic ordinals, I. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 128:103–123, 2004.

[6] L.D. Beklemishev. Reflection principles and provability algebras in formal arithmetic. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 60(2):197–268, 2005. Russian original: *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 60(2): 3–78, 2005.

[7] L.D. Beklemishev. The Worm principle. In Z. Chatzidakis, P. Koepke, and W. Pohlers, editors, *Lecture Notes in Logic 27. Logic Colloquium '02*, pages 75–95. AK Peters, 2006. Preprint: Logic Group Preprint Series 219, Utrecht University, March 2003.

[8] L.D. Beklemishev. Calibrating provability logic: from modal logic to reflection calculus. In T. Bolander, T. Braüner, S. Ghilardi, and L. Moss, editors, *Advances in Modal Logic, v. 9*, pages 89–94. College Publications, London, 2012.

[9] L.D. Beklemishev. Positive provability logic for uniform reflection principles. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(1):82–105, 2014.

[10] L.D. Beklemishev. Proof theoretic analysis by iterated reflection. In G. Summaruga and T. Strahm, editors, *Turings Revolution, Part II*, pages 225–270. Springer, 2015.

[11] L.D. Beklemishev. On the reduction property for GLP-algebras. *Doklady: Mathematics*, 472(4), 2017.

[12] L.D. Beklemishev, J. Joosten, and M. Vervoort. A finitary treatment of the closed fragment of Japaridze's provability logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 15(4):447–463, 2005.

[13] G. Boolos. *The Logic of Provability.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[14] E.V. Dashkov. On the positive fragment of the polymodal provability logic GLP. *Matematicheskie Zametki*, 91(3):331–346, 2012. English translation: *Mathematical Notes* 91(3):318–333, 2012.

[15] D. de Jongh and G. Japaridze. The Logic of Provability. In S.R. Buss, editor, *Handbook of Proof Theory.* Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol.137, pages 475–546. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1998.

[16] S. Feferman. Arithmetization of metamathematics in a general setting. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 49:35–92, 1960.

[17] Evan Goris and Joost J. Joosten. A new principle in the interpretability logic of all reasonable arithmetical theories. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 19(1):1–17, 2011.

[18] T.F. Icard, III. A topological study of the closed fragment of GLP. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 21(4):683–696, 2011.

[19] K.N. Ignatiev. On strong provability predicates and the associated modal logics. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 58:249–290, 1993.

[20] G.K. Japaridze. The modal logical means of investigation of provability. Thesis in Philosophy, in Russian, Moscow, 1986.

[21] J. Joosten and E.H. Reyes. Turing Schmerl logic for graded Turing progressions. ArXiv:1604.08705v1 [math.LO], 2016.

[22] J.J. Joosten. Turing–Taylor expansions of arithmetical theories. *Studia Logica*, 104:1225–1243, 2015. doi:10.1007/s11225-016-9674-z.

[23] S. Kikot, A. Kurucz, Y. Tanaka, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyaschev. On the completeness of EL-equiations: First results. In *11th International Conference on Advances in Modal Logic, Short Papers (Budapest, 30 August - 2 September, 2016)*, pages 82–87. 2016.

[24] G. Kreisel and A. Lévy. Reflection principles and their use for establishing the complexity of axiomatic systems. *Zeitschrift f. math. Logik und Grundlagen d. Math.*, 14:97–142, 1968.

[25] F. Pakhomov. On the complexity of the closed fragment of Japaridze's provability logic. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 53(7):949–967, 2014.

[26] I. Shapirovsky. PSPACE-decidability of Japaridze's polymodal logic. In C. Areces and R. Goldblatt, editors, *Advances in Modal Logic, v.7*, pages 289–304. King's College Publications, 2008.

[27] A.M. Turing. System of logics based on ordinals. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, ser. 2, 45:161–228, 1939.

[28] Albert Visser. An overview of interpretability logic. *Logic Group Preprint Series*, 174, 2008.